AM 1931 W2
M.L. Walworth

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL

Thesis

"THE WAR-TIME CONFLICT BETWEEN RELIGIOUS AND POLITICAL LOYALTY"

By

Mary Louise Walworth

"

Wellesley 1912

Submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

1931

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS
LIBRARY

Ser

p7001

upstairs
378.744
BO
A.M. 1931
wa

The War-Time Conflict between Religious and Political Loyalty.

		Page
I.	Introduction	1
	A. The Present Day Idea of Supreme Loyalty to One's State	1
	B. The Loyalty of an Individual to His Conscience	2
	C. The Removal of the Conflict between Religious and Political Loyalty	3
II.	The State	5
	A. The Origins of the State	5
	1. Theories of Origin	7
	2. A Natural and an Artificial Procedure	7
	B. The Development of National States	8
	1. The Roman Empire	8
	2. The Catholic Church	8
	3. The Reformation	9
	4. The Rule of Monarchs	10
	5. The French Revolution	10
	6. The Period from 1815 - 1870	11
	C. The Purpose of the State	12
	1. Functions of the State	12
	2. A Universal Concept of the State	13
	3. Current Theories of Government	14
	a. Anarchism	15
	b. Mutualism	15
	c. Contract Theory	16
	d. Socialism	16
	e. Communism	17
	f. Facism	17
	g. Constitutionalism	18
	h. Pluralism	23
	4. Emphasis upon State Rights	25

D. The Present Day Idea of Absolute State Sovereignty 27

1. Modern Nationalism 27
a. A condition of Mind 27
b. The Part Played by Propaganda 28
c. Militarism an Important Characteristic 29

2. Ultimate Basis for the Continuity of the State 29
a. Public Opinion 29
b. Loyalty 31
c. Force 32
d. Acquiescence 32

3. Disillusionment 34

E. The Emphasis upon Individual Rights in the Theories of Democratic Government 35

III. War 37

A. The Case for War 37

1. It is Inevitable 37

2. It is Justifiable 40

3. It is Desirable 40

B. The Case vs. War 42

1. It is not Necessary 42

2. It is not Justifiable 43

3. It is an Economic Evil 44

4. Social Ills Result 46

5. Consequences of the World War 46

C. Inventions for Future Wars 49

D. Personal Civil Obedience Essential for War 49

IV. The Conflict between the Teachings of Jesus and the War Methods of the State 53

A. The Teachings of Jesus 53

1. Jesus as a Religious Genius 54

2. Jesus as a Teacher 55

3. The Process of Finding Life 57

4. Jesus as He Lived 59

B. War Methods of the State 61

1. The Deceptive Methods of Nationalism 62

2. The Use of Force as a Group Basis 64

3. The Intrigue of Secret Diplomacy 67

V. The Possibility of a New World Structure 71

A. Substitutes for Force 72

1. The Development of Reason 72

2. The Coordinating of Nationalism and Internationalism 73

3. The Building of a New Diplomacy 77

B. The Part of the Conscientious Objector 82

1. He Considers War at Variance with the Best State Ideals 83

2. He Challenges the Idea of Supreme State Loyalty 85

3. He Recognizes Conscience as His Highest Authority 88
a. The Influence of the Life of Jesus 90
b. Ghandi as an Example 92

VI. Conclusion 92

The Renewal of the Conflict Between State and Religious Loyalty 92

"There never will be a really free and enlightened state until the state comes to recognize the individual as a higher and independent power, from which all its own power and authority are derived, and treats him accordingly. I please myself with imagining a state at last which can afford to be just to all men, and to treat the individual with respect as a neighbor; which even would not think it inconsistent with its own welfare if a few were to live aloof from it, not meddling with it nor embraced by it, who fulfilled all the duties of neighbors and fellow men."

Thoreau

THE WAR-TIME CONFLICT BETWEEN RELIGIOUS AND POLITICAL LOYALTY

Introduction

In this day and age, as a general rule, loyalty to one's government stands at the top of our scale in values. Most every person has been indoctrinated with the idea that one's first and last duty is to his nation; that all other loyalties must be subordinated to a supreme loyalty to the state; in a sense, nationalism has become dogma - actually a cult, today. "Is there any other value men prize so highly that to make it good they would pay the price of twelve million slain, fifty million maimed, and a whole continent plunged into economic ruin? What further proof do we need that government stands as the one thing of supreme importance to the world, the one thing in which we ultimately believe?"[1]

It is usually agreed upon by almost everyone that a state exists to serve the interests of its members; that through it man achieves greater stability and the scattered impulses of a people become unified and organized. However, it will also be granted that the most conspicuous peculiarity of a modern state is its use of force. A state is expected to have and to use force. Upon force depends its feeling of security, and its international diplomacy is based upon war as the final means of defense. To feel safe a nation must be strong.

---

1. L. P. Jacks N. Y. Post Literary Review - Feb. 1922

Moreover, it is due to the acquiescence of the individual in the use of force that it makes it possible for a state to go to war - otherwise war would be impossible. And many people are beginning to realize that wars are entirely undesireable. The results of the World War have taught the lesson that a modern war - whether lost or won - is of no real value to the state; that war is completely unintelligent, cruel, and only a process of great stupidity; that it actually defeats the aims for which a government exists.

If one comes to see that war is the enemy of society; that it frustrates the attainment of the high ends which it is supposed to serve, then ones conscience begins to function and to refuse acquiescence in war. Also, if one believes in the religion of Jesus, one feels obligated to seek the ends which he sought in life and to follow the principles which he taught. "War means everything which Jesus did not mean, and means nothing which he did mean." Jesus went about doing good - loving, serving, forgiving, teaching, rejoicing. Therefore, to enter into an enterprize which involves the wholesale slaughter of men, and in the next war women and children, at the request of the state, has become an impossibility for many people who believe that Jesus taught a creative way of living by means of love; that he revealed the principles for making a friendly, cooperative society.

Out of this situation a very real problem arises - What in the event of another war is a citizen who believes war to be unethical and feels loyalty to his state to do?

He recognizes an obligation of obedience to his state; yet his mind and conscience are opposed to it; and if he refuses participation in the war and becomes a conscientious objector, then he is considered a disloyal citizen.

It is the purpose of this thesis to show that there is no fundamental conflict here. If it is discovered that in modern democratic states individuals have certain rights of freedom and conscience; if it can be proved that war accomplishes nothing but waste and tragedy; if it can be shown that the principle of basing the strength of a nation upon force is fundamentally wrong and unnecessary; and if a citizen can realize a bigger concept of life for his nation than that which includes fighting, then that citizen will be rendering, over a period of years, a great service to his state by refusing to participate in war and having the courage to suffer for that which he believes to be right. In a sense disobedience becomes his duty to his state, in order that a wrong method for carrying on international relations may be changed.

In order to throw light upon this problem which may become one to be directly faced in the future course of years, the author has studied the developments of states, the theories in regard to them, war and its consequences, movements towards its elimination, the state rights of individuals, their religious rights and the importance of conscience in directing life. Also, in two seminar courses, the teachings of Jesus in connection with life were given a highly critical valuation and the process revealed

~~by~~ Jesus found to be scientific in that it is a psychological law of the universe.

The material has been carefully thought through, with the hope that the results may be of value to thoughtful citizens if they find themselves facing a conflict between state loyalty and religious loyalty.

THE STATE

The introduction to this thesis has pointed out what an important part the state plays in the life of an individual, in demanding his supreme loyalty above all other loyalties, even to the point of committing acts which are against the conscience of the individual. Because of this ascendancy of state authority over every citizen, it is important to understand more fully states and governments - how they came into existence and why men came to live under organized groups; how states grew to be powers of such vast importance; what the purpose of a state really is; what are the various kinds of government in power; how the present idea of absolute state sovereignty has come into existence; upon what does the continuity of the state depend;-and most important of all - what are the individual rights which a citizen holds within his state.

There is in existence no definite knowledge as to how and when states originated, but probably nations in the modern sense began to arise when the wholesale migration of races ceased, and people began to live within a fixed territory under one political sovereign, allegiance to whom they accepted. Doubtless, the first step in nationalism was the growth of the feeling of belonging to the land when a man could say, "This belongs to me, this is my own," and when he believed that he could not be driven from it and still live.[1]

---

1. H. A. Gibbons "Nationalism and Internationalism" P. 3

It was the transition from the nomadic to the static stage.

Several theories have been developed as to how states came into existence, and by combining them, one may acquire something of the truth of the early beginnings of states. In the first place, there is the theory of divine origin - i.e. God vested political power in a certain person or groups of persons who became his agents upon earth. 1. This theory was held in the 16th and 17th centuries and became the chief reliance of monarchical governments in their resistance to the growing ideas of popular sovereignty. A second theory is that of the Social Contract. Here a time is assumed when men were entirely without political organization, and the only laws were those of instinct. Gradually people found this difficult, and that it was desirable to enter into new relationships so they came together and agreed upon a government. 1. The individual submitted his will for the first time to the will of the group; in return he received protection and to execute a public will a government was created. Actually, there is no foundation for this theory in history for men must have known what a government was before they could have made one, but practical use was found in this theory for resisting the tyranny of monarchs over oppressed and discontented people.

The theory that a nation is the outcome of the expansion of a family into a clan, next a tribe, then a state is too simple to give any clue to state development in general. 1.

---

1. F. A. Ogg and P.O. Ray - "Introduction to American Government" - P. 16.

It is evident from etymology that originally a nation meant an ethnical family, i.e., one was born into membership by being born of certain racial stock. To be sure, identifying oneself with a nation by right of blood still exists, but racial stock is not an essential characteristic, although there is supposed to be some social reason for being together. 1.

Another theory is that of force. Strong men established themselves over weaker ones, a chieftain became king by using physical force, and thusly a king became an emperor. 2. It is not believed that force is the sole force in the creation of states, for there are other contributing peculiarities. For example, a state partakes of a natural character because

> "The state resembles the family, It has had a career from imperceptible beginnings; it is not at first an object of separate devising; in some form or other it can be traced wherever men cooperate in numbers. Children are born into the state much as they are born into the family; whatever their subsequent relation to it, their first one is involuntary." 3.

Also the state is artificial in character because

> "Every known state, like every known law, has been set up by some deliberate act of agreement, settlement or war. It is always the result of a conscious process. The special forms of these acts are indeed so varied as to defy generalization.

---

1. H.A.Gibbons, "Nationalism and Internationalism" - P.3
2. F.A.Ogg and P.O.Ray,"Introduction to American Government" -P.19
3. W.E.Hocking, "Man and The State"- P. 139

We can find states formed by conquest, planted as colonies or nursed into being by other states; or shaped by the accidents of dynastic convergence or splitting." 1.

States appear to have arisen from many circumstances, both artificial and natural in character. They are natural in origin because there is reason to believe that a state is founded in the unalterable dispositions of human nature, but "whatever this instinct may prove to be, it is not an instinct for forceful self-assertion pure and simple; it is more like an instinct of social self-mastery by way of self-knowledge. The state originates in man's natural impulse to become the conscious arbiter of his own social destiny." 2.

Although the origin of states is not easily obvious, it is possible to trace the development of nationalism from early beginnings to its present day status. Possibly the first great unifying force in Europe was the Roman Empire which spread its political control into Africa and the Near East. 3. It imposed its sovereignty upon all the peoples within the reach of its armies. After the breaking up of the Roman Empire the Catholic Church was the only force for unity that Europe possessed and this continued to be true through the dark ages. For almost a thousand years the Roman Church played an active part in all the conflicts between growing and changing political organisms, and then one of the principle factors

---

1. W.E.Hocking "Man and The State" P. 139
2. " " " " P. 149
3. H.A.Gibbons "Nationalism and Internationalism" P. 3

which gave nationalism birth and fostered it was the revolt against the Church's assumption of universal authority. 1. The Catholic conception of papal authority gave the Pope temporal as well as spiritual authority and the abuse of this power became intolerable; it could no longer be endured.

The modern state is partly the outcome of this religious struggle of the 16th century. The notion of a single and universal authority as possessed by the Pope was utterly destroyed by Luther; and Calvin, the mind of the reformation, was a political genius. His theories for the government of the Church are the foundations of the modern state of today; it' the offspring of the Reformation in England. New kinds of government came into existence and new situations arose. For instance, in England, a man came to owe allegiance to Rome in one set of opinions (religious) and to London is another set (political). Conflict naturally arose and thus from the beginning the problem of the degree of authority to be possessed by the state has been questioned. 2.

From the threshold of the 17th century, the state begins to demand the whole of man's allegiance. The only difference between the rule of the Stuarts and Parliamentary government in England was as to the place in which the supreme power resided. The sovereign rights of the monarch were narrowed, but the beginning of constitutional government did not lessen the national patriotism of Englishman. Mediaeval worship of unity was inherited by the modern state; as the Pope ruled so

---

1. E.M.Gibbons "Nationalism and Internationalism" P. 3
2. H.J.Laski "Authority in The Modern State" P.21

it must govern everything and to so govern there can be no limit to the power of those instruments by which it acts. 1.

The term sovereignty was first used in being given to chieftains of feudal Europe and gradually the term was applied to any authority which gave a final decision. Then, as the central monarchy in France succeeded in conquering the feudal chieftains, it absorbed the term sovereignty for its own use.2. France at the close of the feudal period was a country all cut up and divided. The stronger feudal lords had increased their domains, but they were vassals of other monarchs than the King of France. Gradually, the people of France began to feel a sense of solidarity, and Joan of Arc was inspired with the idea of bringing together the people of France and giving them the idea of nationhood. She pointed out that the only way was through the attachment to one sovereign. And so the monarch came to play a leading role in exalting national consciousness. He was the symbol of national unity and in him resided complete authority. 2. Absolute power was possessed by the Kings of France for over one hundred years — for as long as people believed in the divine right of Kings.

Two hundred years later a radically different theory was developed by the political writers of the French Revolution - the theory of popular sovereignty as residing in the nation or people. 3.

---

1. H.J.Laski "Authority in The Modern State" P. 25
2. J.Mattern "Concepts of State, Sovereignty and International Law" P. 1
3. " " " " " " P. 1

The French Revolution was in its first stages the awakening of people to the consciousness of their privileges and obligations; it was the revolt of a self-conscious people in behalf of their individual liberty and equality against the tyranny and inefficiency of the contemporary "divine right of kings" institution. The flaming zeal of nationalism came later when the country was threatened with invasion and it was feared that the old regime would be restored. 1. Many definite contributions were made to the growth of nationalism by the French Revolution. The state was strengthened at the expense of the Church; it inculcated the doctrine that all citizens owed their first and permanent loyalty to the national state; it inaugurated a national flag, anthem, holidays; it insisted upon a uniform language; and elaborated the first general scheme of national elementary education which should be state-supported, state-directed, compulsory, universal - in which national patriotism would be taught. 2.

The period from 1815 to 1870 was a wonderful and moving era in the growth of nationalism. It is not the purpose of this thesis to trace the development of all the nations which emerged during these years, but it was the most significant period in the development of nationalism. Most important of all, Germany and Italy became nations; Belgium was created, and many other states evolved through revolutions and other prosesses which create nations.

---

1. H.A.Gibbons "Nationalism and Internationalism" P. 54
2. C.J.H.Hayes "Essays on Nationalism" P. 46

It has been briefly sketched how national states have come into existence; how the modern state inherited its idea of complete authority from the Pope's universal power over everybody and everything; how from the French Revolution evolved the theory of popular sovereignty as residing in the people, and how nationalism began to take definite form. But what is the purpose of these states; why do they exist; and is it necessary for a nation to exercise supreme power in order to fulfill the reason for being? Let us now consider the problem and the theories in regard to states, and the rights of individuals in connection with them.

The kind of sovereignty under which people live affects them very radically and serious consideration needs to be given to an authority which has the privilege of tampering with the lives, family, property of citizens. Therefore, the nature of the state is of vital importance. Truly, it fulfills indispensible social functions and a modern state supposedly promotes the welfare of the greatest number of individuals in a given group along certain lines determined by these individuals. 1. Activities in civilized communities are complex and many; they can't be left to the spontaneous regulation of individuals, however intelligent they may be. The state does what one can't do by acting alone, and thus establishes an organic brotherhood wherein each person becomes dependent upon everyone else. Some of the

---

1. F.A.Ogg "Introduction to American Government" P.29

functions required by the state are the maintenance of a government with recognized authority; the preservation of domestic order; the protection of persons and property; the resistence to external attack; the defense against encroachment on the state's authority. 1. Also, there are additional natural functions such as the operation of the postal service; the maintenance of parks, libraries; the construction of highways. In addition there are functions which are variable in every state such as the ownership of railroads and telegraph lines.

States and sovereignty are so intimately connected that it is hard to conceive the one without the other, and it is very difficult to give a universal definition. However, a state can be broadly defined as a "Society of human individuals viewed as a politically organized group." 2. "When this society becomes organized for the effectuation of certain general or political interests and with a magistracy into whose hands is entrusted the exercise of its controlling authority, it assumes a political form and a state is said to exist." 2.

Therefore, in addition to the political aims or interests in the group, there must be the successful operation of a system of control, however simple, which assures the realization of those interests which benefit the whole group. 3.

---

1. F.A.Ogg "Introduction to American Government" P. 29
2. J.Pattern "Concepts of State, Sovereignty and International Law" Intro.
3. J.O.Hertzler "Social Progress" P. 374

It can be said that the universal in the state and sovereignty are the presence of common interests and the existence of a system of effectual control by the group over the individual for the attainment of these interests.1. Often definitions of sovereignty are not theories as to the concept of the state but rather descriptions of particular state organizations; it's a failure to distinguish between the state and its form of government.1. Government is merely the machinery for executing the will of the state.

Men appear to be community building animals and naturally desire to live within a government. If a state fails and a government falls, every man discovers that it is the task of human instinct to provide it once again. 2. It is because there is no feeling of security unless a political community is at hand, and the state does exist as the most adequate means we have yet found or invented for giving this desired feeling of security. So let us now consider the various theories concerning the governments of states.

Anarchism may well first be considered because it is the theory that any government is tyranny and ought not to be endured. An anarchist looks forward to a society of free, self-governing, private groups; he plans that the activities of the government be diminished by degrees until private associations may take them over;3. he seeks to bring about

---

1. J.O.Hertzler "Social Progress" P. 374
2. W.E.Hocking "Man and The State" P. 336
3. " " " " " P. 90

a state of political freedom in which "Every man is free to do what he wills, provided, he infringes not the equal freedom of any other man" (Spencer). He agrees with Jefferson that the best government is/one which governs the least.

> "Anarchy may be defined as a state of society in which the non-invasive individual is not coerced into cooperation even for the defense of his neighbors, and in which each enjoys the highest degree of liberty compatible with the equality of liberty." 1.

Anarchists reject government because they believe there is no ethical or practical necessity for it.

A word about mutualism. Mutualism is a social system based on reciprocal and non-invasive relations among free individuals; a mutualist believes that "every man may claim the fullest liberty to do as he wills compatible with the possession of like liberty by every other man". 2. The theory is based upon individual equal freedom without the invasion of rights of others. Both mutualism and anarchism are very ideal and place great importance upon the rights of individuals - the individual becomes everything; the state nothing.

For a time, many able thinkers believed in the contract theory of government. There were many variations of the main idea that a state was established by contract - i.e. a

---

1. W.P.Bliss "New Encyclopedia of Social Reform" P. 41
2. C.L.Swartz "What is Mutualism" P. 40

covenant was entered into by each individual member of society with every other, to the effect that each individual surrendered to one man or a body of men, his individual right to govern himself. 1. However, in connection with this theory Kant, Green, Bosanquet and others believed that

> "the state must limit itself to external things; that is, to physical action, and can, therefore, take for its purpose only such good as physical force can directly serve". 2.

In other words a state cannot promote morality or religion, although the mission of the state is to promote the best life. The good and the true are initiated within the individual and so the state is limited to external conditions of public welfare. 2. Therefore, considerable responsibility for the welfare of the state is placed upon each person.

The theories which do not place emphasis upon individual rights should not be overlooked---socialism, communism, and facism. Socialists believe in more state control, that a state is not a necessary evil, but can perform positive good. The theory of socialism is that "all affairs should be managed by the government, regardless of individual choice," that all commercial and industrial interests should be in the hands of the state - the government would be the banker, manufacturer, and there would be no competition. 3. The land and tools would be given to the state. Every man would be a wage earner, the state the only wage payer. This theory ends in

---

1. J.Mattern "Concepts of State Sovereignty and International Law" P. 9
2. W.E.Hocking "Man and The State" P. 157
3. B.R.Tuker "Individual Liberty" P. 3

making the government everything and the individual nothing.

Perhaps Communism can be summed up by saying that it is the theory stating that all men should lead a common life.1 Although in 1923, the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics was established under a federal constitution, in Russia, a single political party has exclusive, extra legal control of political affairs. Russia with its millions of members is run by the Communists party of approximately one million persons - with seven members at the top controlling everything. 2. The Red Army of more than one half a million, guards the government from aggression from without and from any possible insurrection from within. The industrial and agricultural workers are the only articulate members of the Russian Soviet State and to be a member of the Communist Party one must subscribe completely to the party program; work in one of its organizations; submit to party decisions; and pay membership dues. 2. One wonders how long it will be before a dissatisfied factor will lead to the organization of another party or if the discipline can be kept so strict that the people will be compelled to remain silent.

Facism is extremely nationalistic. Mussolini has said; "We wish to make the nation Facist so that tomorrow Italian and Facist may mean the same thing," 3. Facism is anti-parliamentary. Mussolini announced when he care into power

---

1. F.A.Ogg "Introduction to American Government" P. 25
2. C.E.Martin "Politics of Peace" P. 171
3. " " " " " P. 213

that he would be glad to rule with the help of the Chamber of Deputies, but that he would rule anyway - even without their support. So, in Italy, a dictatorship has been established and the control of Facism is complete. Minorities are repressed; the constitutional system has been changed so as to prevent criticism or obstruction to the government through legal means; freedon of speech has been curtailed; the press is censored against governmental critism, and the school system changed so that examinations have been transferred from faculties to governments. 1. All this is against any theories of individual rights, and if future history is as the past, this dictatorship will disappear.

Our true interest is not so much in the autocratic type of government where the will of the prince is law or in the oligarchic type where the exercise of sovereignty rests in the hands of a small or specialized group but more deeply in the theory of popular government where sovereign power rests with the general mass of people. As has been previously said, the theory of popular sovereignty evolved at the time of the French Revolution. Rousseau was an ardent exponent, feeling intense reaction to the absolute sovereign power of the personal monarch. For him sovereignty belonged to the people and could only be exercised by the people.

---

1. C.E.Martin "Politics of Peace" P. 216

However, the sovereign people was too large a group for continuous action and so its powers became delegated to complex institutions which we call government. 1. It is through this channel that the state will is expressed. This is true in the United States except there is more than one check upon the exercise of governmental power. The people are ultimately sovereign for "Sovereignty in America, as elsewhere, is the acts of the government as the people and the Supreme Court acquiesce in their enforcement." 1. Therefore, here in the United States we are confronted with a sovereign state and a sovereign state must govern everything. Willoughby ably expresses the doctrine appliable to the modern democratic states -

> "Sovereignty inheres in the state as an attribute flowing from its existence as a political person. It is therefore not possessed by anyone of its governmental organs or by the government as a whole. This appears when the proper distinction is made between a state and its government; the government exercises but does not possess sovereignty; the various governmental organs are but the agencies through which the sovereign will of the state is expressed and carried into execution." 2.

---

1. H.J.Laski "Authority in Modern State" P. 25

2. J.Mattern "Concepts of State, Sovereignty and International Law" - (QUOTES WILLOUGHBY) P. 69

In communities which have reached any degree of definite public organization, public affairs are not carried on in a haphazard manner, without any system or fixed principles, but are governed by bodies logically related to one another and all depending upon certain assumptions regarding the nature of the state, of its sovereignty, of its laws. 1.

The importance of sovereignty is now realized because, it is said, without full and unlimited sovereignty there can be no state. It is the original and absolute authority of the state over all individuals and things that means that it has the ultimate right to issue commands and compel obedience. 2. It is by virtue of its sovereignty that a state determines what kind of a government it will have; sets up its constitution; fixes rights of individuals; makes and enforces its laws. A government has only such authority as is given it, and an individual has enforcible rights against its government but none against the state. 2.

One wonders whether after breaking away from the tyranny of kings, if peoples in democratic countries have merely placed themselves under the tyranny of another kind of sovereignty. If a state has absolute sovereignty, how can men be free? Have they any rights in a

---

1. J. Mattern "Concepts of State, Sovereignty and International Law" P. 89

2. F.A.Ogg "Introduction to American Government" P. 11

modern democratic state? This is important to discover.

As has been pointed out, the original, primary and immediate end of the state is the maintenance of peace, order, security, justice among the individuals who compose it. This involves the establishment of a regime of law for the protection of individual rights and the creation of a domain of individual liberty, free from encroachment either by the individual or by the government itself. 1. Although individuals have surrendered their separate wills to the sovereign state, still they can always arise and make new arrangements. They do retain rights against the government and they are usually regulated by a constitution. In the United States, bills of rights are written into both the national and state constitutions; the American Declaration of Independence says that everyone has the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. 2.

Constitutions are indentified with modern democracies and responsible states. They give liberties, rights, protection, freedom from arbitrary authority; they also mean restraint, law, order. The states have rights and obligations and so have the citizens. The privileges and rights of each must be defined and safeguarded. A constitution means the reconciliation of this liberty with authority; it's a compromise between the basic rights of the people and the essential rights of the state; it regulates the exercise of authority on the part of the government and

---

1. F.A.Ogg "Introduction to American Government" P. 29
2. " " " " " " I. 73

gives guarantees of individual liberty. 1. Therefore, a certain freedom is given to the individual and we do find that men have a certain amount of liberty in modern democracies.

In actual fact no man surrenders his whole being to the state. He has a sense of right and wrong, and if the government goes too consistently against that sense, he is pricked into antagonism and action. The state is sovereign for a man only where his conscience is not stirred against its performance. Also, he expects from the state the fulfillment of its purposes; he expects the state to make possible the attainment of certain things, and what he expects is subject to change. 2. If any person feels the state to be wrong, he can actively oppose that wrong, and whenever there is a group large enough to make its presence felt, it can demand the recognition of certain claims. No state can act in the face of the active opposition of any considerable portion of itself. 2. And so, a government in a democratic country is what the people make it. If wasteful and corrupt, the people can only blame themselves, consequently life within a state becomes intensely personal. The actions of individuals are important for the state, and for themselves.

---

1. C.E.Martin "Politics of Peace" P. 1
2. H.J.Laski "Authority in the Modern State" P. 45

"Life itself is individual and the most significant things in the world - perhaps in the end the only significant things - are individual souls." Each one of these must work its own way to salvation, win its own experience, and suffer from its own mistakes. 1.

Another theory of government is pluralism which refuses to submit to the idea that a state is a unitary absolute sovereignty. Laski is the chief exponent, and he writes about sovereignty that "its powers may be termed absolute, omnipotent, uncontrollable, arbitrary, despotic and is so alike in all countries." 2 Therefore, he does not believe in sovereignty and does not admit a limitation of any kind though the state may be an absolute monarchy or a democracy. Laski agrees that within the state are a great many monistic entities - clubs, towns, counties, universities, churches - each with a group life and a group will. At the present time, the state is considered above them and that all order consists in the subordination of these "many" to the One - that the One rules over the many. 3

Trade unionists and capitalists must surrender the interests of their smaller group to the larger demands of the all-embracing state. Only in a secondary way does a person belong to a church or a class - all are members of the state first . One must fight with the state

---

1. W.E.Hocking "Man and The State" P. 97
2. H.J.Laski "Authority in The Modern State" P. 26
3. " " "Studies in Problems of Authority" P. 5

whether or not one believes in the justice of the cause. What the state ordains begins to possess a moral sanction, superior in authority. to the claim of the group or individual; one surrenders ones personality before its demands. The state is right whether it be right or wrong, and it is a lack of patriotism to criticize it. 1.

Laski adds that there appears to be no moral justice in such an attitude. Acts are considered as right or wrong; groups are considered within the state as harmful or helpful; human knowledge is credited as desirable. He argues that one has to admit that the parts are as real and self-sufficient as the whole, and that the state has no essential connections with these groups although it does have relations with them. "Nothing includes everything or dominates everything." 1.

One asks - How then is the will of the state to be made manifest? The answer given is - Our allegiance is not as a fact unified. In the event of a war, as a member of the state you are called upon to fight; as a Quaker you resist that demand. Is the demand of the state all important? Yes, to the state. 2. Then, what lawyers mean by sovereignty is abolished and resistance to the state is justified. Laski thus denies that states possess a determinate authority whose will is certain of acceptance. 2. It is evident that

---

1. H.J.Laski "Studies in The Problems of Authority" P. 8
2. " " " " " " " P. 11

no such instrument does exist; no where is the assurance that any rule of conduct can be enforced. To enforce a rule depends upon the opinion of the members of the state and they belong to groups to whom such a rule may be obnoxious. The true meaning of sovereignty is to be found not in the coercive power possessed by any group but in the fused good-will for which it stands. "When sovereignty prevails, where the state acts, it acts by the consent of men." 1.

What guarantee have those of the pluralistic view that the will of the state will prevail? Their answer is - "The will of the state obtains pre-eminence over the wills of other groups exactly to the point where it is interpreted with sufficient wisdom to obtain general acceptance and no further."2. If it ventures into dangerous places, it pays the penalty. The will of the French monarchs was not the will of the state and Louis XVI went to the scaffold.

In considering the various theories of government it is apparent that individuals do have certain rights which are safe-guarded in democratic states, usually by constitutions. In the United States citizens have a double safeguard because of living under both state and national constitutions which contain Bills of Rights. And religious freedom is protected by the first Amendment. Ideally, in the modern state the individuals have entered into a pact with each other to produce a government and it would seem that not only do these

---

1. H.J.Laski "Studies in Problems of Authority" P. 11

2. " " " " " " P. 13

individuals have rights but also a responsibility for the moral welfare of their state; a responsibility which involves their conscience, and active interest in the affairs of their state. This is an indispensible condition of good citizenship. Before giving consent to any action it is the duty of the individual member of the state to carefully scrutinize the policy and resist it if it is not right. So actually, if the citizens are alert, the sovereignty of a state is limited; the power which it can exert is never absolute at any moment, because it is dependant upon social approval. [1]

> "The state, we broadly say, exists to promote the good life, however variously defined, and we give the government the power to act for the promotion of that life. Its acts then are colored by the motives that lie behind it. It wins our loyalty by the contribution it can make to the state purpose." 2

When it acts in accordance with that end, it is self-evident that it is obeyed, but what if it acts otherwise? How can one tell if a state act is in accordance with right purpose? Is there any other way except by individual judgment? Therefore, the real basis of law is in the individual mind. "Law cannot be a command, its a rule of conscience and has to prove itself." 3. The state is a reservoir of

---

1. H.J.Laski "Authority in The Modern State" P. 42
2. " " " " " " P. 28
3. " " "Problems of Sovereignty" P. 13

individualism because each will is something that ultimately is self-determined. 1. This makes the government a constantly changing institution - whether for better or worse depends upon the moral stamina of the citizens.

In contrast to the above emphasis upon individual rights and responsibility one finds today the idea of absolute state sovereignty which demands that everyone's first and last loyalty be given to the state. It has been previously stated that nationalism is an intense and universal ~~Mark~~ of the current age, and may be called the most significant emotional factor in public life today.

> "Nationalism denotes a condition of mind among members of a nationality, perhaps already possessed of a national state, a condition of mind in which loyalty to the ideal or to the fact of ones national state is superior to all other loyalties and of which pride in ones nationality and belief in its excellence and in its mission are integral parts." 2.

Briefly the basies of nationalism are first a uniformity in language because it produces like mindedness and develops group consciousness; secondly a common history which recalls outstanding events - the deeds of heroes and major crises. Also, the belief that the members compose a distinct, cultural society with distinctive customs and art. Religion has played a part in the past but its not an invariable attribute. Man has always applied his sense

---

1. H.J.Laski "Authority in The Modern State" P. 30

2.C.J.H.Hayes "Essays on Nationalism" P. 6

of loyalty to ideas, places, persons, but today he applies it primarily to his national state. 1.

> "Now whole peoples have been systematically indoctrinated with the tenets that every human being owes his first and last duty to his nationality, that nationality is the ideal unit of political organization as well as the actual embodiment of cultural distinction and that in the final analysis all other human loyalties must be subordinated to loyalty to the national state, i.e. to national patriotism." 2.

This idea of nationalism is modern, very modern.

Usually, a national policy of an established state means a policy of selfishness and possible aggrandizement. Internally, it aims to strengthen the natural bonds by every means possible; externally to make the nation feared or respected by a bold and firm foreign policy - backed by a sufficiency of military force.[3] To tighten the national bonds within, propaganda is used which is the attempt to instill in the minds and hearts of human beings their supreme loyalty to their respective nationalities and states. It has become the driving force in the lives of the masses today because of the instrumentalities of mass education, although it was first evolved and proclaimed in many lands by groups of intellectuals. Compulsory national schooling is the basic means of spreading this doctrine of

---

1. C.J.H.Hayes "Essays on Nationalism" P. 18
2. " " " " " P. 23
3. " " " " " P. 157

nationalism. It is taught in the schools; encouraged by military training, preached by the press; symbolized by the flag; it touches the life of modern man from birth until death.

The belief that national security can be maintained only by armed force leads to militarism as the second great factor, because to assure national rights of safety and to preserve national honor an established state must be prepared to use force and to wage war. 1. Modern nationalism not only brings nations to war but keeps them prepared for war, and militarism with its display of might and threats of force has become a permament ~~factor~~ institution. The maintenance of large armies on land and sea are outstanding characteristics of the modern national state.

Though propaganda and militarism are factors in contributing to the feeling of modern nationalism, it is necessary for a state also to have a feeling of security. A nation must have a reasonable degree of stability and continuity. It can't be created one day and destroyed the next, and have no degree of permanency. There are important factors which contribute to the basis of continuity of the State, and among these are public opinion, loyalty, force, and acquiescense on the part of the individual.

The whole political system of modern democratic governments is based on the rule of the majority which is a

---

1. C.J.H.Hayes "Essays on Nationalism" P. 158

working plan by which one attempts in a rough way to determine policies of common concern. Public opinion is considered to be the opinion which embodies the views supposed to be held by the bulk of the people. 1. Until a vote is taken, its power has no legal claim but ministrys and legislatures are obliged to take into account the different currents of opinion which exist and shape their policies according to the ones which appear to have greatest strength. In this sense the people are always ruling because their will is recognized as supreme when it is known; and is often felt for practical purposes without the voting process. Mr. Chafee has written that one of the most important purposes of society and government is the discovery and spread of truth on subjects of general concern, and that this is only possible through unlimited discussion. 2. But to give infallibility to a majority vote and to proclaim the voice of the people the voice of God is vicious nonsense. For knowledge, for truth, for a valid line between right and wrong, one does not consult the greatest number. 3. Herbert Spencer observed that majorities are generally wrong - a majority of people supported the burning of witches, upheld slavery, etc. Politicians recognize men as creature of feeling and impulse, and know the value of psychology. They study

---

1. James Bryce "Public Opinion" P. 153
2. Z. Chafee "Freedom of Speech" P. 34
3. Fosdick "Old Savage" P. 26

how to stir instinct and impulse; what kind of an appeal will arouse mass action; what bait incited solidarity and adherance to a cause. 1.

It has been pointed out how citizens, through national propaganda, are made to believe that their state is better than any other state; also through the schools and through life they are taught to be patriotic, and to support a government's policy whether it be right or wrong. A typical patriot may be considered as one who salutes the flag, cheers, and throws tons of tape on a national hero, and Tolstoi defined patriotism as "a course, disgraceful, bad sentiment. It is responsible for armaments, and wars." 2. He considered patriotism an unnatural, irrational, harmful sentiment, and one that ought not to be cultivated. The right kind of patriotism may be defined as wishing real good for one's nation or state, but patriotism has become a sentiment of exclusive love for one's nation. In schools children are taught that their nation is best. "My country right or wrong" can be called the most immoral sentence in the English language because it defies ethics. A state is not outside moral categories, but is bound by them. However, for permanence a state needs lovalty, and so invokes it until patriotism becomes a religion and men are willing to lay down their lives for their country without regard to the rightness of its policies.

---

1. Hocking — Intro.

2. Leo Tolstoi "War, Patriotism, Peace" — P. 87

Very early in this thesis it was stated that the most conspicious peculiarity of the modern state is its use of force. Force has come to be a fundamental attribute and each nation proceeds to make itself as physically strong as possible with armies on land and navies at sea. Often, the more civilized a nation is, the more militaristic it feels it must be. Force is what the state is expected to have and to use. Unless it makes good its physical supremacy it is generally considered to have failed in its mission. But what is the justification of the use of this great force? It has led to wars and to the killing of millions of men. In addition, a government may seek to deny citizenship to anyone who refuses to use force. However, Hocking refuses to make force using the essential and defining mark of the state. 1. If it is legitimate it must be explained and this problem will be seriously considered later on - whether the state can justify and explain the use of force or not.

It has been shown that modern states build their sense of permanence upon public opinion which may not at all represent the truth - for example, a nation at war cannot tolerate independent thinking in its minorities and so from the moment hostilities are declared, truth is abandoned for its own sake and selected news is distributed wholesale, and propaganda (for the most part false) shapes all ideas to one end. Again, it has been

---

1. W.E.Hocking "Man and The State" P. 78

shown that permanence is based upon the creating of a blind loyalty, and the word patriotism has fallen from high estate because it has become used as a synonym for narrow-mindedness, exclusiveness, fanaticism. Blacklists, including the best names in the country are spread in the name of patriotism. Also, the modern state is dependent upon physical force. Yet, the very real factor, is that of consent. No state can act in the face of opposition of any considerable part of itself or can venture to claim control over certain areas within the jurisdiction of other groups. 1. Those who refused obedience to the military Service Act of 1916 in Great Britain proved the powerlessness of the state to enforce them into subjection. 1. Convinced of the inequity of war, they claimed the right to be free from direct contact with it. In America the Quakers received special exemption. Therefore, the individual conscience does come to play a part in each state. The greatest truth to which history bears witness is that the only real security for social well being is the free exercise of mans minds. The only permanent safeguard of a democratic government is that the ultimate sanction of intellectual decision should be the conscience. 2. Here is a realm where no state has any rights, and the greatest contribution a citizen can make to the state is that he should allow his mind freely to exercise itself upon its problems.

---

1. H.J.Laski "Authority in The Modern State" P. 45

2. " " " " " " P. 55

The trouble is that people have become politically tame and idealized the state; they have mixed facts with an imaginative sense of what they ought to be. To be well governed would be of highest value and the state is taken as the promise and possibility of being eventually well governed. "The state is given the benefit of its political future." 1. "In sober fact, government is exerted in the interests of those who control its exercises; that it exercises power in the interest of the state as a whole is pure idealism." 2. For example, the business of government is so largely industrial in nature that it is profoundly affected by those who hold the keys to economic power. It's been said that the state is a group of men and interests engaged in getting all they can out of other men. It is held together most strongly by economic power. 2.

In 1918 - 19, there was a strike among the workers of the General Electric Company in Schenectady which threatened them with losses gained through the war. On the front page of the strikers paper there appeared these headlines. "Put this under your hat. When those hypocrites have gotten what they want out of you, have they any more use for you?" 3.

---

1. W.E.Hocking "Man and The State" P. 80
2. H.J.Laski P. 40
3. W.E.Hocking "Man and The State" Intro. P.XIII

The state is not yet a perfect institution, it cannot measure up to a standard which gives it the right to demand the complete loyalty of its members; which is the present idea of absolute state sovereignty. This is placing an excess value upon the state. The state is not the only group which claims ones better reason and conscience. There are business organizations, unions, churches in which citizens have memberships. When the state makes its demands, they are not silent. Each of these may claim a loyalty against the voice of the state. Perhaps one group will become strong, and a democracy, however well organized, is liable to degenerate into government by a section of the people, administering its activities to suit their views and their interests. 1. It would seem as if a modern democracy is what the people make it. The responsibility is placed directly upon them to use their power for right and justice.

In reconsidering briefly what has been said about the state one finds that its purpose, ideally, is to serve its members, promote the good life and to discover truth on subjects of general concern. Also, in a modern democratic state, emphasis is placed upon individual rights of freedom and conscience, but modern nationalism is not always mindful of these rights. Because of the states dependence upon public

---

1. A.T.Hadley "Freedom and Responsibility" P. 20

opinion and the loyalty of its citizens, certain methods used to create this feeling have become false. Also, the modern state depends upon force and whether war is to be justified or not is yet to be seen. However, because the state is not the perfect institution which it is thought to be, the individual comes to play an important part. In the last analysis, the state does depend for its continuity upon the acquiescense of its members. Whether they consent or not to its methods is a matter of great concern.

WAR

In considering the factors of nationalism, it was earlier stated in this thesis that the belief exists that national security can best be maintained by armed force which leads to militarism. This is because nations reserve to themselves final decisions in all matters pertaining to national honor and vital interest. Every state has the right, according to national precept and practice to pursue its national interests in whatever way and by whatever method which seems right to itself alone. 1. That is, a state exists in a State of Nature to other communities - it is outside the law and is a law unto itself. These national rights may be desirable but they are also dangerous, because they lead to war. And they lead to war because force is depended upon to make the final decision.

Because a nation settles its disputes through war and maintains large armaments in order to do so it is necessary to consider what war is, whether it is an inevitable, desirable and justifiable method for determining problems; wherein exist its advantages and disadvantages.

---

1. C.J.H.Hayes "Nationalism" P. 167

War is a conflict between two groups each of which attempts to kill, destroy, or injure the other in order to get what it desires. 1. Wars grow out of ordinary human nature from their sudden impulses. People accept war with readiness because they easily believe that which is not true. Life is made up of impulses. We run and shout and sing, not because we stop to think about it but because we like to. Reason shows that war does untold harm to all combatants, that it is mere madness, but it is often prompted by the impulse to the activity itself. During peace time if one predicts war there is little attention paid to the idea, but when war, promoted by deliberate forces, actually approaches the people get war-fever, and nothing can stop them from fighting. Since human nature is said to be unchangeable by some people and constituted with impulses, it is argued that war is inevitable because nations like men have the same characteristics which often become more marked. History confirms that out of every thirteen years of war there has only been one year of peace. Consequently, a nation has felt the need to prepare for war and its policies are based upon this fear and possibility. Each state developes power for the inevitable. Through education it creates the mental, material, and moral sobrietity of the people and through arming and propaganda it cultivates

---

1. Bertrand Russell "Why Men Fight" P. 82

loyalty so that when the crises does arise, the nation will be ready.

Perhaps more than through the impulsiveness of human nature, war is likely to arise because of the absolute sovereignty of each state. 1 As has already been stated, at present, each nation is absolutely independent of every other nation with the power to make peace or war with any other state. The claims, which are made declaring this right to do so, are various - that a nation's ideals and culture are superior; that it possesses an important mission for the world to perform; that its aspirations and policies are righteous (if any others conflict, they must be wrong as each nation evolves its own conception of righteousness); that its highest duty is to survive. In a speech on Feb.15, 1915 the German Chancellor said, "God has assigned to the Germans a place in the world and a role in history which demands continual sacrifices. Our pride should make us bear them with good heart." And on the other hand one reads the statement - "To us, the British, has been given by our history a work and a mission perhaps the loftiest ever assigned to a people." 2

Naturally, each state because it is in competition for existence with every other state does that which is for its own best interests, and acts upon the fundamental principle that national necessity is above the law. 3 A national

---

1. Krehbiel "Nationalism, War and Society" P. 1
2. " " " " P. 85
3. Wyatt "Nineteenth Century" P. 825

necessity takes precedence over everything else, over treaties, alliances, promises, international laws. Then the citizens are expected to support the policy pursued by the nation; they are required to approve of the cause adopted even if privately they do not believe in it. Neutrals, also, must yield to this necessity, and to prove the righteousness of the cause, God is declared to be on the side of the nation. Since force is the ultimate solvent in the state differences, each nation develops power for the conflict, whenever it is to be, and carries on its international affairs with the feeling that great strength must necessarily rest behind the dealings of their diplomats, and inevitably this force will be brought into action.

Not only has war been considered inevitable by statesmen, but it has often been thought justifiable. A nation has to defend its own rights against the invasion of the nations, and therefore must prepare itself in order to play its own part. Theodore Roosevelt wrote in his book, "Fear God and take your Own Part"; that a nation should scorn to do wrong to great or small but that "the only possible way by which to enable us to live at peace with other nations is to develop our strength in order that we may defend our own rights." Therefore, for self defense war is justifiable. Many people believe that this is especially true when a nation is attacked by another state which is unquestionably and wholly in the wrong as an aggressor; that a nation has the right to defend itself against actual aggression.

Bernhardi is known because of his statements in regard to the desirability of war. He has written "Everyone will admit

that endeavors to diminish the dangers of war and to mitigate the sufferings which war entails are justifiable. It is an incontestable fact that war temporarily disturbs industrial life, interrupts quiet economic development, brings wide-spread misery with it and emphasizes the primitive brutality of men."[1] Still he goes on to say that, "I must try to prove that war is not merely a necessary element in the life of any nation, but an indispensable factor of culture, in which a true civilized nation finds the highest expression of strength and vitality."[2]

If war is such a divine, desirable institution the reasons for believing this to be true must be considered. First of all the idea exists that the fighting instinct is manly and honorable; that it is a sign of virility within a nation if it has the courage to fight for its own rights. "War is human nature at its highest dynamic. Militarism is the great preserver of our ideals of hardihood and human nature with no use for hardihood would be contemptible".[3] Without war, the citizens of a nation would be in danger of becoming a race of weaklings and mollycoddles. Secondly, that war exerts a strong moral influence. It develops the desirable qualities and virtues of patriotism, efficiency, inventiveness, discipline, and that it saves a nation from social decay and stagnation. A third reason is that war performs the biological function of selecting the nation with the ideals best fitted to survive; that it prevents over-population.[4] Another reason is that it gives economic advantages to the victor who profits at the expense of the vanquished. This may be done by annexing territory, exacting indemnities, or by crushing the trade of the

---

1. Bernhardi "The Next War" P. 18
2. " " P. 16
3. Wm. James "Memories and Studies" (Moral Equivalent for War) P. 276
4. Krehbiel "Nationalism, War and Society" P. 16

rival nations. 1 Some of the lesser advantages are that war gives employment to a larger number of people; that new trades are taught to civilians; that scientific work and research progresses; and lastly that the armies are often useful in times of peace. 1 The San Francisco fire is cited as an example of this kind of usefulness.

Since the reasons which bring about war have been reviewed, it is now time to think more carefully into the situation and discover if they are justly founded.

Because human nature is impulsive and because nations resemble human nature, is it necessary that war should result? Would it not be possible for a nation to develop a positive life of impulses and passions in opposition to those which lead to war? The pacifist recognizes this inherent impulsiveness of human beings, but desires to see a stronger impulse against war built up within a person than the one which leads to war. A passion to think clearly can overcome the passion for fighting, and it is possible to build a positive life of positive impulses so that a passion for peace and justice will overcome the passion of war (2) if they are directed towards life and growth instead of toward death and decay. A nation without impulses would be feeble, but they can be of a positive kind. Human nature can be changed - slowly, not all at once. Prof. Hocking states, " It is human nature to change itself."

---

1. Krehbiel - "Nationalism, War and Society" P. 16
2. Bertrand Russell "Why Men Fight" P. 18

Is the next assumption, that, because a nation is the highest step in human progress, its actions are above the law, a correct one? It is not true that any one nation excels every other in every particular or that special excellencies of one are superior to the special excellencies of another.[1] No nation is superior to every other nation. It is a common idea that a conflict between national ideas is irrepressible because the culture of each nation is peculiar to it. National cultures need not be rivals. Shakespeare is appreciated outside of England. Men have become world citizens, economically and culturally; they are no longer nationalists except politically. For this reason, international cooperation within the law has become possible among nations of the world to a certain extent; not only possible, but beneficial and necessary if there is to be an end to the waste of war.

That war is justifiable when it is rightfully used for defense is another argument which can be refuted. What is the right and who determines it? This is too often decided by the rulers, whether they are monarchs or elected. Wars in their inceptions are virtually the private business of the diplomats who depend upon force to justify their decisions.[2] Their might makes them right. Then their decisions are approved by the emotionalism of an uninformed public, and official censorship sees to it that the independent thinkers secure no hearing. Wealth and influence have the ear of the ministry and the alleged right equals the interest of the dominant group. International anarchy results from ignoring the existence of another nation's

---

1. Trebbiel "Nationalism, War and Society" P. 27
2. " " " " P. 1

self-made standards, and both sides claim to have justice on their side. Although each nation may be partly in the right, it is not possible for both sides to be entirely right at one and the same time. Besides, the individual has to yield his concept of right to that which is the concept of right of the group in power.[1] Their statesmen may claim that the war is being rightfully carried on for defense when individuals would decide otherwise if actually facts were known by them.

Also, the argument that war is justifiable in defense against an aggressor nation when it is unquestionable and wholly in the wrong can be refuted. In the first place, there is rarely a war where the aggression can be judged by all participants to be exclusively attributable to one side, and it is not likely that any neutral and international authority could pronounce it to be so.[2] There is always room for a difference of opinion as to where the aggression begins.

> "The murder of a citizen by a foreigner, the infringement of economic rights or commercial markets, the infraction of the civil clauses of a treaty, the diplomatic ultimatum with unjust demands are all construable as acts of aggression. The mobilization of troops is a hostile act nearly as much as is territorial invasion".[2]

Probably no civilized nation could be induced in this day and age to engage in a frankly aggressive war, and it would be doubtless impossible to persuade any belligerent that its part in any war was wholly aggressive. Every combatant power fights

---

1. Krehbiel "Nationalism, War and Society" P. 102

2. H. J. Cadbury "An Inadequate Pacifism" P. 2

for freedom or defense--for the defense of something or other. In the Civil War the North fought in the defense of the Union and the Negro, the South in defense of state rights and private property. Therefore, the vindication of war on the plea of defense ~~does~~ becomes quite universal, and no one is able to determine the sole aggressor.[1]

In the second place, to justify war against an aggressor implies not only an authority able to decide upon the aggressor (which appears to be almost impossible), but, also, it implies a state of mind on the part of the belligerents that will consider delay and alien arbitration--a psychological difficulty which would be hard to overcome.[1] A nation roused for fighting could hardly be induced to delay while an impartial group studied the situation in an effort to determine the aggressor. If a delay in conflict could be arranged, the fever for war would doubtless pass by and the atmosphere clear without any fighting. Again, military strategy would never tolerate delay. The necessity of getting the jump on the enemy grows greater than less with the development of speed in modern warfare. When nations have air fleets which can destroy cities in a few hours after war begins, no state would dare to give an enemy a few hours start in order that time be taken for the consideration as to who was the aggressor.

Finally, the outlawing of aggressive war has no solution for a war once started. When war once begins, both sides are equally on the offensive. The first act of aggression is followed by innumerable other acts on both sides which are

---

1. H. J. Cadbury "An Inadequate Pacifism" P. 3

in defiance of all laws and conventions. Anyhow, might never settles anything fairly, so why should force be used as a bases of settlement even if the aggressor could actually be determined. War and justice have no relationship. If ever a nation should be wholly the aggressor, the attacked state in refusing to give violence in return would be in a position to actually prove its innocence upon taking the case to the World Court. Here, a surer defense of their rights would be found against aggression than that of resisting with force and running the chance of being defeated.

As an asset, it has been stated that war makes for virility within a nation; that it develops manly traits. This fact may be acknowledged to a certain extent. War doubtless does develop a certain kind of courage, and surely a nation of courageous men is preferred to one of cowards, but is it not possible to develop manly characteristics without becoming involved in the horror of war? Prof. William James suggested that instead of military conscription that there might be a conscription of the whole youthful population for a period of years when the ideals of hardihood, discipline, patriotism, would be wrought into the fibre of the people by building roads, tunnels, and performing peaceful duties of the state.[1] This method might not be practical, but it suggests that there are other ways than war of developing a splendid race of men.

Moreover, war actually drains away the best of blood

---

1. Wm. James "Moral Equivalents of War" P. 290

and degeneracy results from the exploitation of the other country. The biological aspect from war grows serious as the strongest, keenest are killed; the weakest and most degenerate are rejected from the army and survive. Not war but honest labor, industry and thrift make for national solidity and a virilent nation.

It has always been considered that a victorious war was of great economic advantage to the winning nation, but Norman Angell calls this "The Great Illusion." The winning nation actually does not profit at the expense of the vanquished. In peace times there exists an economic current of exchange of goods, which flows irrespective of political units. Things are bought, sold, interchanged without rivalry. War disturbs these normal conditions and creates an abnormal one. The demand for goods changes, risks increase, business becomes uncertain, prices rise and fall.[2]

The cost of financing the war becomes terrific; taxation is increased and money borrowed at a disadvantage because it must be advantageous to the creditors. Then peace brings about a reversal of the conditions and another readjustment as at the outbreak of the war. The disbanding of the army creates a great

---

2. Norman Angell "Great Illusion" P. 36

unemployment problem, and the dangers of booms follow because money has become easy again. In the meantime the nation has acquired a great public debt. The American Civil War increased the debt of the United States from sixty-five million dollars to two and one half billion dollars. War indemnities have never shown a profit, but the high prosperity of small countries which do not go to war, as Holland, is marked. Their national stocks stand higher in the finance market, and their standard of living is high.[1] The argument is not that war is impossible but that it is futile, useless even when a nation is completely victorious, as a means of securing those moral or material ends which represent the needs of modern European peoples.[1]

In the Treaty of Versailles, little was overlooked which might not impoverish Germany or obstruct her development in the future. The question is,- Was this a gain for Great Britain and France and the United States who were victorious in the war? Before 1914, an easy and comparative frictionless interchange of commodities existed in every past of the world, but since the war Europe has been poorer than before its outbreak. The average wealth is less and some classes in many countries have been substantially poorer.[2] The war caused every kind of a difficulty and maladjustment; the system of interchange of commodities has been arrested, impeded, shattered; and victorious and conquered nations have suffered together. At the present time, over twelve years since the Armistice Day of 1918, the whole world is suffering from a severe business depression.

---

1. Norman Angell "Great Illusion" P. 40
2. Parker T. Moon "Imperialism and World Politics" P. 112

It has been suggested by several influential business men that an international conference should be called to build up German trade in order to enable Germany to pay her war reparations. It is believed economic prosperity would then return.[1] Such is the great illusion. First Germany destroyed; then Germany rebuilt by her conquerors because of their own resultant suffering.

Include in this picture the tragic unemployment situation with which Great Britain has been struggling since 1918, and the debt problem which is to be handed on to future generations who had no responsibility for promoting the conflict, and one begins to realize that the Great World War was of no advantage to most of the nations, whether vanquished or victorious.

Aside from the economic consequences, the social evils resulting from war are endless. Take a few statistics from the last war--10,000,000 men lost their lives; 5,983,600 were listed as prisoners or missing; 5,000,000 war widows, and in France alone above 887,500 fatherless children.[2] These numbers are so vast that it is impossible to visualize what they actually mean in the loss of life, or in the number of tragedies for families.

Besides the loss of life there are other pictures of tragedy caused by the war to be looked upon. Millions of people were forced to flee from their homes by invading armies. Dr. Folk has written--"We have seen refugees walking footsore, burden bearing,

---

1. Parker T. Moon "Imperialism and World Politics" P. 112
2. Kirby Page "War, Its Causes, Consequences and Cure" P. 84

falling by the wayside. We know of mothers carrying new-born babies for miles. We have seen refugees packed by main force into stifling freight cars and slowly hauled, with many long interruptions, somewhere into the interior - hungry, filthy, depressed."[1] This happened, all told to some 10,000,000 people.

Perhaps it is even worse than the tragedy of loss of life and property; than the fierce suffering caused by fighting, for a nation to lose through war hysteria the ideals and principles upon which it has been founded. Here is one picture of what happened in the United States, painted vividly by Frederick C. Howe who has held important governmental posts,—one of them at Ellis Island. He writes in his "Confessions of a Reformer" that because of the war hysteria thousands of suspected persons were sent to Ellis Island as the most available dumping ground with evidence so flimsy, so emotional, so unlegal in procedure that his legal judicial sense revolted against the injustice of deporting them."[2] For two years after the war such a panic of "red fear" swept the country that hysteria swept aside all law. Quoting from his essays:-"Things that were done forced me almost to despair of mind.....The Department of Justice not only failed to protect against hysteria, but encouraged these excesses; the state not only abandoned the liberty which it should have protected, but lent itself to the stamping out of individualism and freedom..... I had fondly imagined that we prized individual liberty. I had believed that to the Anglo-Saxon human rights were sound and would be protected at all cost."[3]

---

1. Homer Folks "The Human Costs of War" P. 142
2. F. C. Howe "Confessions of a Reformer" P. 267
3. " " " " " P. ~~XXX~~ 276

Add increase in crime, increase in disease, national hatred, and the neglect of educational institutions and the case for war ceases to exist. It can also be said that the war failed utterly in settling any moral issues; it did not establish democracies or a spirit of democracy - the fundamental reason for which it was fought. Parliamentary governments have actually been overthrown since 1918.

Having looked over the glaring results of the last war, it is well to think for a moment of the possibilities in the next international conflict. Prophecies say that there will be jets of water charged with electricity to kill horses and men; ~~unless~~ WIRE control of tanks and airplanes; ~~unless~~ WIRE heat to destroy whole regions; giant transport airplanes of incredible speed; armoured boats capable of diving under the water and of flying in the air - a kind of combined tank-submarine-airplane; bomb carrying airplanes and gas killing instruments, using such poisonous gas as is beyond the dreams of a maniac; a warfare including whole areas of non-combatants.[1]

The last war was a mild experiment in the possibilities of shedding destruction from the air. The flying machine was not one quarter as effecient at the time of the armistice as it is today. The last war was a demonstration of artillery, the next one will be principally a display of chemistry. Commander Burney of the British Navy says that gases now exist that are more than one thousand times as powerful as used in the past.[2] In hundreds of

---

1. London Cable "New York Times" August 1923
2. Sherwood Eddy " Danger Zones of The Social Order" P. 35

laboratories, physics and chemistry are being harnessed to the task of discovering ways for mass destruction, and humanity stands in peril of its own inventions. There is a new invention of a radioactive substance in which one hundred fifty tons of dynamite — enough to blow a modern city into oblivion - is compassed into a pound weight which can be held in the hand.[1] H.G.Wells has written - "Destruction is not threatening civilization, it is happening to civilization before our eyes."[2]

Perhaps, after another war, there would be some pieces left which could be reassembled and put together again to rebuild a nation, but to many people the havoc wrought through war by clashing governments begins to look like a failure in political wisdom. It appears as if war was a wanton destruction of the more important things of life in the interest of the less important; as if it sacrificed the very end - protection and life - for which a state exists. It matters greatly that there should be built up a body of informed, intelligent, independent public opinion - free from mob-mindedness of war or peace which can be counted up because it has thought its way through all the implications of war, though as yet it has not worked its way through.

And herein rests the responsibility of every single citizen, for war cannot be carried on without the acquiescence of the people. Everyday, it becomes more clear that war cannot be waged successfully if it is opposed by any appreciable minority not susceptible to threat or intimidation. A condition approaching

---

1. H.E.Fosdick "The Old Savage in the New Civilization" P.13
2. Sherwood Eddy "Danger Zones of the Social Order" P. 35

complete national unity is essential to war which necessitates the increasing use of propaganda.[1] It has been estimated that if 2% of the citizens become war resisters within a state, war then becomes impossible for that state. Once a war is imminent, no real facts are accessible - every cable carries falsehood; every telephone wire is polluted. For example, the United States was deeply shocked by the stories of atrocities in Belgium, that children's hands and women's breasts were being cut off by German soldiers; after the war, no proof of such actions could be found.

It's no easy thing to whip up a population to war. The people have to be lied to, and lied to so much that huge machinery has to be set up - machinery of censorship and suppression on one hand, of lying propaganda on the other.[2] Finally, there has to be relentless conscription in order to get the needed number of troops. After the United States entered the World War in 1917, the army enlistments from April 1st to July 1st were 301,696. At this rate it would have taken thirty-three months to have raised the 4,400,000 men who were enlisted by November 1918.[2] England called for volunteers. The loyal, [illegible], generous, patriotic responded by thousands, but when the government needed hundreds of thousands, such an appeal broke down. Human nature did not appear to be very war-like and eager to fight. In Great Britain, Mr. Arthur Ponsomby has secured over 130,000 signatures to a peace letter which was sent to the prime minister and which stated that the signers explicitly refused to produce munitions or bear arms in another war.

---

1. D.Allen "Pacifism in The Modern World" P. 177
2. " "The Fight for Peace" P. 146

There are doubtless thousands of others who did not sign the letter, and the presence of such a number of war resisters, constitutes a threat to any future war policy.

The purpose of this chapter was to consider whether war was inevitable, justifiable, desirable. The findings are that it is not inevitable because human nature does change and can be slowly changed. It is possible for man to build up a life of positive impulses so that a passion for peace, justice, and clear thinking will overcome the passion for war. Also, national cultures need not be rivals. International cooperation already exists in many forms, and it is possible to develop it farther until war is entirely outlawed.

War is also not found to be justifiable on the basis of right and self defense. This is because it is the group in power who determines the right and their might makes it possible to direct the thinking of the country at large. It is significant that in a conflict both nations claim to be right, but both can't be right at the same time, although each side honestly believes that their cause is the true one. The reason is that the right is not decided upon by any impartial, lawful method. However, "if one nation was entirely in the right, and the other entirely in the wrong as the aggressor, is not war then justifiable?" The answer is that there rarely is a war when one nation can be judged by any neutral authority as exclusively the aggressor. The reasons for war are usually many and involved; besides, after a war starts no state can afford to delay retaliation in order that the aggressor may be determined. Moreover, a more adequate defense against

aggression may be found in courts of justice than in resisting with force. In other words, it takes two to make a fight.

The advantages of war! Do any exist? Perhaps it makes some men courageous, virile, hardy, but men can acquire these virtues without war. Besides, it does not make for true virility because it takes the best blood in the country, and huge numbers of those who survive are shell-shocked, diseased, neurotic.

Economically, war has been found to be a great illusion because of its interferences with the natural exchange of trade; because it causes a change in prices, an increased burden of taxation, unemployment, debts for future generations to carry; and business depressions usually follow. The resultant social evils are ghastly - terrific loss of life is involved; refugees are driven from their homes; and worst of all is the loss of national ideals through war hysteria. Moreover, the iniquity and havoc of a future war cannot be visualized because of modern inventions. Apparently, there appears to be nothing great enough to justify the endless evils of warfare.

It looks as if war sacrificed the very thing for which the state exists - the protection of life and property. Lord Rosomby, the British statesman has said -

> "I maintain that by far the most tragic thing about war is not its immorality, nor its cruelty, but its manifest and colossal futility and imbecility. I maintain that war achieves no single object of advantage in the high sense to anyone, nor does it attain any of the supposed aims for which it is waged."[1]

In thinking deeper one finds that because nations have depended upon force in their international relations, the evils of modern nationalism have come into existence and have developed — the evils of falsehood in propaganda and militarism. This is natural because for anything as terrific as war a unified public opinion and a blind loyalty are essential. Therefore, any means which will obtain this end must be used.

However, the significant discovery is that war depends upon the acquiescence of the individual. Here one begins to realize the tremendous responsibility placed upon the citizens within a government. They can actually prevent war by refusing to have war hysteria and to give their consent. Even a small minority group, if it has conviction of the futility of war, can save its nation from joining in another hellish conflict. Other methods not dependent upon force for settling international disputes do exist to which citizens can give their enthusiastic support. They will be considered later.

---

1. D. Allen "The Fight for Peace" P. 217

IV. THE CONFLICT BETWEEN THE TEACHINGS OF JESUS AND THE WAR METHODS OF THE STATE.

In human nature there exists a religious sense; man consciously or unconsciously worships something or other. A man may loose faith in a special religion, but then he chooses another object of worship. Perhaps it is himself or his nation, but at any rate it involves a reverential emotion. Religion is a commanding element in the experience of living men, the greatest of all forces in the moulding and moving of human life from one age to another.[1] Jesus was a man with a religion; he was probably the greatest religious genius who has ever lived, and as a religious person, it is interesting to consider him, and his teachings. There is a difference between the religion about Jesus which was started by Paul and John and became Christianity, and the religion of Jesus which was an intensely personal thing. His teachings resulted from his religious experiences which were passionately real to him.

In a way it seems strange that Jesus should be reckoned among the great. He lived his early life in the little village of Nazareth in Galilee; his public life was confined to his own native land, a small province of the Roman Empire; he died a young man, probably not more than thirty years of age, and he did not die as other great men have with thousands of followers. His small circle of companions fled from the scene of arrest

---

1. W.E.Bundy "The Religion of Jesus" P. 293

after one had betrayed him into the hands of his enemies, and only a few faithful women witnessed his burial. Still, his influence upon history for nineteen centuries has been great and ineradicable. He has lived in humanity to an extent which has tremendous significance.

Beginning with the childhood of Jesus, an incident reveals the fact that as a boy Jesus had a feeling for religion. His parents took him to Jerusalem for the feast of the passover. Upon their way home, they missed him; then after three days they found him talking with the doctors, the leaders of religion. When rebuked for having caused his family enxiety, he replied with surprise - "Wist ye¢ not that I must be in my Father's house?" Why the surprise? Because he believed that they should have realized his curiosity to have more spiritual insight.

After his baptism by John, Jesus felt a profound sense of acceptibility to God. A greater consciousness of God possessed him than he had felt before - a sense of approbation, approvalship, and there is no experience more profound. He retired into the wilderness for a long time to consider what form of activity would make up his life work in connection with his relationship to God.

Jesus lived in a turbulent world. Foreign conquerors were ruling Palestine, and there were grevious burdens. Taxes were exorbitant, and the Roman rulers were stern and relentless. But, the Jewish people were filled with an intense expectation - the Messiah was to come who would lead them in overthrowing their conqueror and oppressor. The whole pressure of Jesus' environment was for a political leader; the people were looking for one. Jesus was tempted to be this leader, but he rejected

the possibility for becoming a great national hero as not the way to serve God. Also, the religious hope of the people was for prosperity; they believed that if they were good, God would feed them. Jesus rejected this conception that righteousness brought prosperity, and as he rejected all the popular ideas of the time for a national leader, he was gradually getting a clearer sense of his mission.

From his days of struggling in the wilderness, trying to decide whether to live a life of popular activity or as a man of God, his fellowship with God became deeper, and at last Jesus arrived at a positive assertion. He came to realize that the promoting of selfish ambitions was not God's way of life, but there was other known good which he might serve. His whole concern was to discover and to do God's will and finally he decided upon a career of teaching as his means of expressing ~~of~~ God's will. In this career he found life. He became a Faith-possessed, God-dominated individual.

It is only possible to barely touch upon the teachings of Jesus; there is not time to dig into the truths behind them, but as Jesus lived and taught he began to be critized. He was critized for healing on the Sabbath; for associating with sinners; for his attitude towards fasting. In return Jesus taught that man was above the Sabbath. He declared that for the Sabbath rules did not bind him because he dealt with human necessity. Sunday was meant to be a day to serve men, and men were not to become servants to Sunday rules. In regard to fasting he sail that it was only valid when it brought one nearer to God; that it should be done only at suitable times - for example - not at

a wedding feast. In short, a sense of need was the underlying factor of all his relationships with people.

In the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus talked on great themes which were elements in the Jewish law - such as - alms giving, prayer, fasting. Instead of formulating laws of conduct, Jesus taught that it is the attitude behind the conduct which is significant. Real righteousness has to do with the heart; inward attitudes and thoughts are important. Life is not judged by outward conducts - as praying to be seen of men - but by the heart desire of a person.

From the treatment of these practices we learn of the personal religion of Jesus - that it was an intimate association with God. His life, without austentation was an outward expression of his inner life rather than for the approval of men; it revealed a deep fellowship with God. Jesus' religion equals a way of life; his whole life was a sacrament to doing the will of God; to discovering God's purpose for him; to deriving the sense of approvalship of God. It was not a desire for social approval but for that which was right and the finest and best.

It may now be asked - How does one derive the sense of acceptibility to God or Oneness with God - the peace and satisfaction of being well integrated? In Jesus' life there was no disunity or duplicity, and Jesus taught that it was not easy to find life whole. "Narrow is the gate, and straitened the way, that leadeth unto life, and few be they that find it." One immediately begins to wonder and to discover what Jesus means by a

---

1. Mathew 7 : 14

straitened way if one is to achieve life. On the other hand, Jesus said; "Not everyone that saith unto me Lord, Lord; shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in Heaven."[1] Here Jesus gives a desirable goal, but how attain it? "By doing the will of my Father." This is the outstanding theme of Jesus.

There is a problem in doing the will of God; in discovering what it is. However, in Mark 3:35, Jesus spontaneously asserts that he is doing the will of God by saying - "For whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother and sister, and mother." This implies that others can and do do the will of God. This was the goal of Jesus' life - a passion attitude. In order to do this he learned from observations of nature, whatever he could of God's ways and taught them as he discovered them in parables. In one parable he said that the "Kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is a merchant seeking goodly pearls; and having found one of great price, he went and sold all that he had, and bought it."[2] This reveals the fact that there is an inner process by which one acquires values which are better than any possessions. Ghandi has said that all things which seem to be of value have no values - such things as automobiles and radios. They are illusory!

It is of vast importance to discover from Jesus' teachings this process to which he often refers; how one sells all that he has, or at what point an individual loses all that he ~~has~~ possesses? Again Jesus taught, "Whosoever shall seek to gain his life shall lose it, but whosoever shall lose his life shall preserve it."[3] The phrase more

---

1. Mathew 7:21
2. " 13:45
3. Luke 17:33

which covers the process is "lose his life". Then what is the content of this phrase? Briefly, the center of an man is the place from which he makes a choice. A person has lost his life when his volitional element is effected - when no longer his self but God is put first. At every stage in life Jesus was confronted with the necessity of choosing. In his life of love a choice had to be made again and again, and he went to his doom because of the irreconcilable conflict between his way of life and that of his contempories. So Jesus taught the process of ridding oneself of self and the re-orientation of values. This is where prayer enters in; it is the relentless rooting off of layer and layer of self, like the peeling of an onion. The result is the finding of life - or complete self-hood, and this comes about by the free and absolute choice of the individual person.

One of the scribes came to ask Jesus - "What commandment is the first of all?" and Jesus replied; "Thou shalt love the Lord, thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength. The second is this, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."[1] This implies an inner attitude of giving ones whole self to God. As the word love implies an emotional feeling which may at first be absent in regard to ones neighbor, the word "Giving" or "Being directed towards" could be used as a substitute until the neighbor comes to be known; then he will be loved. For instance, when a dog comes into a home, he is not particularly loved, but love grows by knowing him and the dog is really loved. This may also be

---

1. Mark 12:30

illustrated by what happens in war. When a battle is suspended one of the worst dangers to morale is "fraternization", as the soldiers on the opposite sides became friendly from knowing one another; "Brotherhood bites deeper than bullets." In the last war soldiers had to be shifted about because they grew too friendly with their enemy.[1]

In the process "of losing oneself and finding life" cooperation became a necessary requirement. Jesus taught that the non-cooperator perishes for he discovered this to be the way of the universe. He also revealed the fact that in doing the will of God fear is removed. He did always what he did as an expression of the mind of God, and consequently had no fear whether in a storm or when facing death. Only for a moment did he lose his contact with God at the time of his crucifixion.

Consequently, Jesus teaches the process by which one finds the greatest of all values - life. He makes known a psychological law, and no knowledge is as important as the discovery of that law. Jesus showed the validity of life lived from within, and that the will of God must be discovered through a life of love.

Jesus lived as he taught. He aimed to build life upon a relationship of love and regard for the welfare of every member of society. The supreme challenge of Jesus to his disciples was — overcome evil with good, love your enemies, forgive seventy times

---

1. Deven Allen "The Fight for Peace" P. 149

seven. He went about doing good, living consistently because in Jesus there was no duplicity of thinking one way and acting another; loving, teaching, serving, suffering and rejoicing were the characteristics of his life, and he could not abandon this way of living even to avoid crucifixion. Jesus treated men of every race and color as equal. In His sight all men were of inherent and inestimable value; he knew no feeling of race superiority. He taught the equality and brotherhood of all races and nationalities; justice and charity to all; peace on earth to men of goodwill; humility and self-sacrifice, and he lived unto this manner.

In the minds of the Jewish people, politics and religion were tied very closely together; they did not think religion and politics could be separated. God was thought of as being on the winning side in war. They hoped for deliverance from the Roman Empire through a religious leader; and the matter of paying tribute to their oppressors was to them a very vital question. Perplexed by this contemporary issue, some Pharisees came to ask Jesus - a teacher of religion - this question - "Is it lawful to give tribute unto Caesar or not? Shall we give or shall we not?" They were eager and earnest for an answer. Jesus gave a startling one; he thrust a dart into the heart of the conception that God had any connection with any state or was the head of it. Quickly, he replied - "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's."[1] With one clear stroke he removed the idea that there was any issue between the

---

1. Mark 12:17

state demands and religious demands. As he taught consistently that his purpose in life was to do the will of God, it can be assumed that he believed that to God was the place of his ultimate allegiance and not to the state. So, to Jesus there was no issue - be rendered tribute to the state because it was due the state, but his relationship to God was an intimate personal affair. By free choice, he gave himself to God to do His will, and this relationship was not connected with any state or society. This issue still lives today, but Jesus has shown that there actually is no issue between the state and God. The Kingdom of God is irrespective of any political system; its an individual matter.

The teachings of Jesus have been considered. Now, in comparison, what are the methods of the state? Are they in keeping with the teachings of Jesus or not? It has been previously stated that tremendous emphasis has been placed on developing nationalism within a state until it has become a veritable religion - capable of arousing and compelling emotion which is essentially religious. People have unquestionably come to worship their state, but nationalism as a religion inculcates neither charity or justice; it is proud and not humble; it involves wars and all their terribleness.[1] And nationalism which lives by the sword is diametrically opposite to the teachings of Jesus.

It has been stated how every citizen is now educated to believe that absolute sovereignty is a right inherent in his national state and that any impairment or threatened impairment of that sovereignty is a wrong which cries to Heaven for vengeance, and

---

1. Hayes "Nationalism" P. 95

and any interference with this right is sin.[1] The people insist that their state and nation shall be treated by others with due reverence. If their "god of nationalism" is blasphemed by foreigners, the nationalist recoils instantly and seizes any available force to avenge the national honor. Also, the people have the right to pass laws of conduct for people within their territory, and although this legislation may be satisfactory for the citizens at home, it may create ill will abroad. This makes no difference to the state. It has a right to do these things even if they create hard feeling and are unjust. Still worse, the state insists that the government's policy be suprorted whether right or wrong. What is thought wrong for the individual to do is perfectly right for the nation. This is very immoral.

To make the actions of the state look just, propaganda is used and the methods of propaganda have already been described. There is no truth or honor in shaping public opinion; lies are spread wholesale, and for war the fighting instincts are aroused by any possible way. This creating of national public opinion has been done so cleverly in the past that even the churches have given their support. The readiness with which the church and ministry, since the days of nationalism, have fallen in line when the drums have been sounded is a matter of history. In the last war Mr. Hillis of Brooklyn was one of the worst offenders. In behalf of the second Liberty Loan, he spoke more than four hundred times in one hundred sixty-two churches. He asked

---

1. Hayes "Nationalism" P. 183

his audience - "Where shall you find a record of soldiers, whether red, black or yellow, save Germans who were such sniveling cowards?"[1] The devil had entered every German and any atrocity was always committed by "Hellish Huns." In his book, a chapter called - "The Foul Crime against Women", the Germans slaughtered old men and matrons, mutilated captives in ways that can only be spoken of in whispers, violated little girls until they were dead; and the worst atrocities cannot even be mentioned. His addresses were masterfully delivered to crowded halls of war-crazed people. Believing these things to be true, his main objective was to rouse anger and hatred and resentment against the Germans. Such poison was given in the name of religion; this was his exposition of applied Christianity.[1] Does it sound like the teachings of Jesus - the teachings of love and forgiveness.

Admiral Fiske testified even before the war that the church was using a powerful influence - not towards peace but war and their leaders were supposedly the apostles of the Prince of Peace. Safely in the war, the ministry settled down to the bloody business of egging on their parishioners to fighting. At a Methodist Conference, Rev. E. F. Weise declared - "I am an American but a Christian first". The assembled clergy cried him down with, "Traitor".[2] Later, R. H. Odell in an article called - "Peter Sat by the Fire Warming Himself", started the pastors to thinking by stating that the church had created a world more united in hatred of Germany than in love for Jesus.[3] And this was all in the name of nationalism.

---

1. G. Hicks "The Parsons and the War"
2. " The American Mercury, Feb. 1927 P. 129
3. " " " P. 132

The trouble is that the good at which nationalism aims is for one nation only and not for all mankind. Nationalism is a reaction against historic Christianity, against the mission of Jesus. Considered as a religion it inculcates neither charity nor justice; it is proud and not humble.[1]

Earlier in this thesis the point has been made that for a feeling of security and permanence the modern state relied upon force. As each great western nation conducts its international affairs on the basis of force, it feels the necessity of possessing military strength equal or superior to every other nation. This results in the fear of other states - the fear that some state may become superior, and consequently feels the need of increasing its own military and naval strength. Battleships are built for security; armies are increased and the cost of military equipment for a government becomes very great. It must necessarily include a number of things from battleships to training camps. There are guns to be manufactured, naval stations and army posts to be maintained; barracks, arsenals, munition factories, engineering outfits which all have to be financed, so that the expense to the government becomes excessive. In addition, the equipment rapidly depreciates in value as there are constantly new inventions in every department and all the machinery must be kept up to date or else it becomes useless. President Hoover warned the American people to the effect that current expenditure on strictly military activities of the Army and

---

1. C.J.H.Hayes "Nationalism" P. 95

Navy constitutes the largest military budget of any nation in the world today and that during the present fiscal year (1930), the expenditures will reach over $750,000,000.00[1]

This is armed peace and the futility of armed peace became apparent at the time of the World War. This policy had brought about a competitive race and the cost of competitive armaments had risen rapidly - all out of proportion to the increase of wealth in the respective states. In spite of it all no nations felt one whit more secure. As soon as one nation led a bit in armaments, the others would combine. Each nation was striving to outwit, and outdo the others by whatever means it could. The race for securing more and newer equipment continued and spies endeavored to corrupt citizens by getting them to reveal government secrets, upon which method of diplomacy the nations were conducting their affairs. Then suddenly with everyone armed for peace, all Europe was plunged into a frightful war.

In the province of Fukien in China there is a military governor who is exceedingly unpopular. He defends himself with guns and has thousands of soldiers under his command. The result is that he never dares to go out of his house. He goes out very seldom and then under the protection of a heavy guard. In spite of all his soldiers who are ready to protect his life, he is not secure; military arms and military strength have not made him safe.

---

1. The Churches and World Peace - A message to The Churches P. 7

Germany had built battleships and trained a magnificent army in order to be safe, but Germany neglected public opinion - and ranged the world against her. She disregarded arrangements made with other nations, and Great Britain used this betrayal of Belgium as the reason for fighting Germany. The deep underlying cause was more selfish, i.e. the fear that Germany might secure territory along the English Channel. This could never be allowed! Germany, however, believed that her great military strength would make her a winning nation but she was outdone - a lesson to the world that mere strength does not make for safety.

Militarism, existing for national honor and prestige actually creates fear - a very undesirable thing because it leads to war. Again, machinery of war is repudiated because it stands for destructive methods rather than a cooperative world. Jesus without stint or limit taught that love and sacrifice are the redemptive forces in life. He aimed to lay slowly, stone by stone, the foundations of a friendly cooperative society. The worst difficulty with society today is that it is not cooperative. The United States considers what is best for the U.S.A., and not what's best for the world. In addition to fear, this spirit of uncooperation leads to war; and another war may lead to destruction. This nation had better become aware of that fact. No state can safely consider itself superior to any other state. There was no superiority of races in Jesus' teaching; nationality was entirely submerged.

War has already been shown to be the enemy of society. To review briefly, the World War has created great economic problems of poverty and unemployment for both victorious and conquered nations; 10,000,000 men lost their lives; millions were forced to leave their homes; national ideals were lost; crime increased. Therefore, war it a denial of the teachings

of Jesus. This is true even when it is waged in defense of an aggressor nation - i. e., if it could be ascertained that one nation is the sole aggressor. It is a denial of the teachings of Jesus because of the immorality of the method. For the moral question of war is a question not of ends nor of guilt, but of means.[1] Jesus never mentioned aggression, but the duties and attitudes discussed by Jesus are recommendations for the victims of aggression. His unmistakable advice is the avoidance of the self-defensive acts that involve retaliation, revenge, insistence on one's own rights. He suggests a method for the use of good against evil, which avoids the duplication of sin, and disarms or converts the aggressor. The end, even if it is absolutely free from aggression does not justify the means, and the use of force is an evil which can't be justified upon any moral grounds. The teachings of Jesus outlaw war as a method whether defensive or offensive. The use of force is an evil and can't be justified upon any moral grounds.

In the Manual of Military Training - the text book used in colleges, one finds the following in the 1923 edition.

> "Bayonet fighting is possible only because red-blooded men naturally possess the fighting instinct. This inherent desire to fight and kill must be carefully watched and encouraged by the instructor. Force him (your opponent) to the ground and break his neck by suddenly throwing

---

1. H. J. Cadbury "An Inadequate Pacifism" P. 5

> the feet well to the rear and falling forward, tightening the arms and pressing the shoulder tightly against the back of the head. This hold when properly executed will break the opponent's neck".[1]

Does this teaching resemble that of Jesus? Is it the way to train our youth in building a friendly, cooperative world? The text book adds - "The principles of sportmanship and consideration for your opponent have no place in the practical application of this work. The object of all military training is to win battles".[1] And wherein lies the gain in winning battles!

The affairs between nations are carried on by methods of diplomacy. Originally diplomacy was an art which certain men possessed for advancing the interests of his king and country. Whatever means achieved these ends were allowable, although filled with intrigue and treachery. As the number of affairs

---

1. Eddy and Page "Danger Zones" P. 44

have increased between nations, diplomacy has become an important part of the functioning of a government and is now considered a profession in almost every country, demanding a high standard of intelligence. Diplomacy has been based upon the accepted suprosition that to be safe one must be strong; consequently the fear of the increasing strength of another nation made each diplomat anxious to discover the secrets of every other diplomat. State secrets had to be discovered and state secrets had to be kept. There has been much romance about the great skill, wise statesmanship, the extraordinary ability, and lofty patriotism of certain famous diplomats, but to the student who desires a close acquaintance with the essence of finesse in deception and fraud as a fine art, diplomacy in his hands is an open book.[1] Through centuries, the chief duties of a diplomat were to deceive, and the profession involved downright deception.

Its been a peculiar situation that a nation has not been able to be open and candid. In fact, the more honest the diplomats were the more they were suspected of an ulterior motive. Etiquette has always existed, but no rules, and the game played has been compared to that of poker in which each player tries to deceive the other; trying to conceal or give a wrong impression of the cards in his hand.[2] Naturally, secret diplomacy lead to deception because open honesty would mean disclosure, and a person can't be secretive without some

---

1. W.F.S. Pulton M.A. Morality of Diplomacy p. 120 Liverpool Philomathic Society 1902.

2. W.F.S. Pulton Morality of Diplomacy p. 121

dissimulation.[1] In the decisions made, some temporary advantage may have been won, but confidence is bound to be destroyed between the two contrasting parties when the truth comes out; and the result is dissatisfaction.

This method of secrecy has brought about secret treaties and engagements which have weakened public treaties and have committed people to causes which they did not approve. No greater illustration can be given than the difficulties which centered around the treaty of Versailles in Paris. Secret treaties, which had been made during the war and kept secret because of the effect they might have upon the masses and upon the liberal groups in America, cost the Council of Ten and Council of Five at Paris an endless amount of time. Also, a treaty resulted which the United States refused to sign - a treaty broadly condemned because it contained injustices, resulting from agreements of which the United States had not been aware.

The basing of diplomacy upon secrecy has often led nations to war. In the past, the morality of a nation has been on a lower level than that of an individual. A man feels himself responsible to his community, but a state has no feeling of responsibility to anyone. For them the end justifies the means - not exactly an honorable role.

Summing up the war methods of the state, one finds nationalism created through falsehood; militarism which creates fear, hinders cooperation, and ends in war; and secret diplomacy carried on by deception. There is nothing particularly honorable in this analysis, nothing which resembles a spirit of truth, honor, cooperation, love. It is

1. W. H. S. Pulton "Morality of Diplomacy" P. 121

discovered that there is real conflict between certain methods of the state - especially those used in war-and the way of life taught by Jesus! And Jesus especially taught that institutions which come into existence should exist for the good of men. Is a state which plunges into war and conscripts men for fighting serving ~~them~~ men or aiming to accomplish selfish interests? The process which Jesus taught is universal; it holds for the state as well as man. Modern nations had better beware, for a combative way of life brings death. There is a pamphlet called - "Why I returned My Croix de Guerre" by Oril Henthorne. At first she became troubled by Armistice Day Parades. They rarely remembered the dead and the responsibility owed to them in the way of peace building, but became opportunities for emphasizing the military spirit of the younger generation — to wage preparedness for more war. Then she re-studied the life of Jesus, and discovered his aim of building society on a renationship of love, and decided to bend every energy to work for understanding among persons and nations. The Croix de Guerre was born of war; stood for war which is the resulting expression of present day nationalism, and therefore, she was compelled to return it because of her allegiance to Jesus who said - "as I have loved you, ye are to love one another."

THE POSSIBILITY OF A NEW WORLD STRUCTURE.

The previous chapter has shown that unquestionably a conflict exists between the teachings of Jesus and the present methods of the state which depend for permanence upon force which in turn leads to war. The use of force is an evil and it cannot be justified upon any moral grounds. It breeds hatred and ill will and abnormal conditions for living; and history has proven its worthlessness as a method in solving social problems. But why depend upon force? Is it necessary? Is there no other alternative? Is there not something else which can be depended upon for its continuity? In answer to this, here is an admission from Napoleon who wrote -

> "War is an anachronism. Some day victories will be won without cannons and bayonets --- Do you know what I marvel at most in the world? The impotence of force in organization. There are only two powers in the world, the mind and the sword. In the long run the sword is always defeated by the mind."[1]

Benjamin Kidd, a generation ago, stated his belief that the more rational men became, the less they can find a reason for assuming the risks of fighting, as the state can count on war only when an irrational religious faith sustains its appeal.[2]

---

1. Devere Allen "Pacifism in The Modern World" P 137
2. Hocking "Man and The State" P 80

But why have a war? The state has as yet no purpose great enough to justify such a terrific use of force. To have a place in the sun or to monopolize world trade are not sufficient reasons for creating the ghastly tragedies of war. In cultured nations, the primitive instincts are controlled so that men live quite peacefully together. Besides, war is not necessary because men are beginning to discover that through the use of reasonable and cooperative methods, international affairs can be carried on without warfare. To enforce international obligations other mighty forces are available - such as the moral power of public opinion, the diplomatic boycott, and financial and economic pressure. However, nations must first commit themselves against a war system and build upon a structure of peace which includes diplomacy not based on force, conciliation, arbitration, international courts, regular international conferences to consider economic and political questions, permanent international agencies as the League of Nations and the International Labor Office, and gradual disarmament.[1] These are the means by which a new world structure may be built and in back of these methods are mind and reason which in the long run are more potent than force.

In the new world structure, the ideal is to achieve international unity. Ways of doing this should be more carefully studied. Much has been said about nationalism

---

1. Devere Allen "Pacifism in the Modern World" p. 167

and all the evils connected with it, but nationalism is not all evil. It is a natural instructive thing and can become good as well as bad. It all depends upon its use. It can come from a nation's conscience and bring out the best in man - a pride and self respect in his state; it can reflect the best ideas in art, culture, law. Especially, it can be of great cultural value. The several nationalities have made, and are still making special contributions in architecture, literature, art, dancing, customs, which express the ideas and feelings of a nation and create a national consciousness.[1] Because nationality is an aspect of the gregarious instinct in man, it should be directed and no attempt made to suppress it, but it need not conflict with internationalism. Internationalism presupposes a prime loyalty of the individual to his national state. The languages, traditions of a man are cherished within him; he is patriotic but he also is able to recognize evil in contemporary nationalism and tries to remedy it with a respect for everyone. To urge internationalism is not to decry patriotism but to purify it. True patriotism is love for one's country which involves humility. "In humility we shall labor to bring to it all blessings and hopes of humanity".[2] Internationalists should make the best nationalists, because men who give time to the affairs of their community also make good family men as they bring new interests into the home. In this way nationalism is the compliment of internationalism. Each exists because of the other.

---

1. Hayes "Nationalism" P. 197

2. " " P. 247

There is no doubt about it, the coordination of nationalism with internationalism is eminently desirable, and ways by which it might be done should be considered. Beginning with primitive society one finds that families, clans, tribes and nations all went to war, but within the groups they started to develop a common law in order to secure justice and individual rights. With the beginnings of groups, force became of two kinds - first, internal as the group became a peace society with a police force to keep order; second, external force which was that displayed when groups or states clashed.[1] This has remained competitive and justice has been sought by violence. It is now everyone's responsibility to work out the principles which will bring international justice and peace within an international police force.

The principle of education is to prepare persons for life. Why not begin by teaching them to think rightly and scientifically, thus reducing all their fear, superstition, and ignorance which are connected with war.[2] The truths about war, peace, nationalism and internationalism should be taught. The truths about other nations should be made known and their good points recognized.

Study and travel have already removed many international and racial prejudices. Through improved communication and transportation individual citizens of one country mingle with those of another, and products of commerce are carried everywhere.[3] The number of international organizations are appalling

---

1. Krehbiel "Nationalism, War and Society" p. 114
2. " " " " p. 142
3. " " " " p. 137

Library, Labor, Law, Education, Sports, Sciences, Religion - these and many more fields have world associations. The cultural life of society has become internationalized; the political life is still national, and the cultural life is sacrificed at its expense when a country goes to war. Political institutions have fallen behind the actual facts of history.[1]

Internationalists hold that nationalism is no longer an expression of the age; that it is out of date but it is not possible to change this theory suddenly because nationalism plays such an important part in the lives of so many people.[2] It is incredibly difficult to make them recognize a new principle - that the good of all nations will be for their own national good. This involves a change in their conception of patriotism. Goethe wrote "Above the nations is humanity" The old patriotism equals "Our country, may she ever be right, but our country right or wrong." The new equals "Our country, when right to be kept right, when wrong to be put right." Patriotism may be an integral part of one's every feeling at all times and it is still possible to love one's country even if one is able to see superior good qualities in other nations and inferior qualities in his own. In the "Moral Equivalents for War," Prof. James substitutes in the place of military conscription, one in which citizens perform peaceful duties for the welfare of the state which will create patriotism as loyal as that developed by war but

---

1. Krehbiel "Nationalism, War and Society" P. 157
2. " " " " P. 220

in a different way. This nationalism becomes not at all inconsistent with internationalism. Other ways to break down the mental and emotional barriers which exist between peoples are by making sure that in ones personal relations with individuals of other races and nationalities one reflects the genuine spirit of brotherhood, and also by aiding in the creation of a public opinion which will transform the more impersonal relations of ones nation with other nations. Knowledge of ones own national faults and what others think is helpful to have.

Too much stress cannot be placed upon the necessity of international education. The life or death of a nation in the future depends upon ideas. What is wrong for an individual can't be right for a nation. This present muddle needs to be thought through, and clear thinking will make for progress. There are many international organizations but there is one world wide institution which can be tremendously effective - i.e. the Christian Church. Is it too much to ask their ministry who aim to be followers of the religion of Jesus to introduce the principles taught by him into international life? Instead of fostering nationalism they could become teachers of internationalism. Also, perhaps this is a place where anarchists can make a real contribution. An anarchist realizes that a state of war arrests the progress of justice and freedom. Peace is an essential condition to the spread of right ideas and the growth of the sentiment of toleration.

Therefore, the anarchists rely upon methods of education and of passive resistance.[1]

In building a world structure of peace, it will be necessary for the nations to acquire a new type of diplomacy which is not based upon force. Within a nation, society is based upon and peace maintained on the principle that controversies can be settled peacefully. Reason has overcome blind impulses in the life of individuals and communities. Law has done incredibly well in harmonizing the life of the people within the state, and is it not possible to find a principle upon which to base diplomacy in order to regulate international life? Everyone has an interest in living, and to serve one's best economic interests one relies upon cooperation with one's fellows. Human beings have always joined in a corporate entity to safeguard and advance their interests.[2] It accounts for the existence of the state. And now that the world had become one through the telegraph, telephone, and wireless, economic interests have become international, international methods of cooperation must be evolved upon which diplomacy can be based. The minds of men have a challenge and an opportunity in making the world a safe unity.

---

1. W. P. Bliss "The New Encyclopedia of Social Reform" P. 42

2. C. Hayes "Nationalism" P. 164

It is possible to make a greater effort to strengthen wisdom in the international field of life. Because two nations come to blows is no reason for not trying to discover why. Because physical force has been the last resort for settling disputes is no reason why no effort should be made to avoid it. Because diplomacy has been with out the range of law does not make it impossible for it to be changed and brought within the law and principles of morality. War has resulted from conditions under which human nature has been compelled to work; that is in rival national groups which are arbitrary and not inevitable.[1] If the conception of rival nations can be replaced by the conception of cooperative nations, universal peace may be brought about. The thing to do is to work out conditions which favor peace instead of war and organize diplomacy around such methods.

International law is one method upon which a new diplomacy may be built. It began to appear in the 12th century and has been developed by treaties between states and court decisions. It lacks uniformity and an adequate sanction. Nations are bound by them only as long as they choose to be so bound, and its development depends upon the standard of public morality.[2]

Arbitration has long been used as a means of settling difficulties. Serious wars have been averted by using this method, including boundary disputes, violation of territorial integrity, commerce, etc. The cost is insignificant and there are other decided advantages. First, delay gives time for

---

1. Krehbiel "Nationalism, War and Society" P. 33
2. " " " " P. 137

passions to cool off; secondly, it compels each state to define the ground on which its claims rest, thus disengaging minor from really significant causes; thirdly, it enables public opinion in each of the states to see the issues, and gives a chance for the expression of opinion whether war is justified or not; fourthly, it gives other nations information upon which to judge points of issue.[1] How important this is, is shown by the efforts of Germany, France and Great Britain to get public opinion on their side at the time of the World War.

It should be one of the objectives of diplomacy to discover definite ways by which nations will settle their difficulties by arbitration or by accepting court decisions. The Court at the Hague has settled many disputes, and the World Court came into existence with the League of Nations.

The conference method does much to destroy suspicions and alarms which are the worst enemies of peace. Conferences remove jealousy, suspicion, fear - breeders of ill-will. These conferences should be improved and extended as more than any other thing they create good international feeling. The creation of this good-will is absolutely necessary as the treaties and pacts are worth little more than the paper upon which they are written except in so far as they are made potent by good-will.

The Locarno Conference has become famous in history. In it, there are plenty of loopholes for war, but the spiritual significance of it has made a charge against force. This conference is diplomatically important because the countries

---

1. James Bryce "International Relations" P. 153

definitely committed themselves to a pacifist policy in the future. They surrendered their right to make war, and national honor is now bound up with peace instead of war.[1] A definite pact was signed in which the signatories undertake not to make war and pledging that arbitration will be considered at all points of difficulty.[1]

Another suggested principle upon which to base diplomacy is that the possibility of going to war should be submitted for a vote from the people. The burden of carrying on the work of the state necessarily falls upon the shoulders of the few who are responsible, but public opinion can check the use of force in a crisis and test the problem by principles already accepted.[2] It can be tested by reason, because it is maintained that a society, based on the principle that controversies can be settled peacefully, is possible. On this theory, the world society of the future must be founded.

The League of Nations is the greatest illustration of the new methods of diplomacy which are being used. It is a great step forward in the evolution of human history - so great that vast numbers of people do not appreciate its real significance. The central purpose of the League is to preserve peace and it builds up plans to cover the greatest possible number of events which might lead to war; its guiding principles ~~are~~ are conference and delay. It also promotes international cooperation in many diversified fields from matters

---

1. George Glasgow "From Dawes to Locarno" P. 123
2. Walter Lippmann "The Phantom Public P. 11

of health to matters of labor which are handled in the International Labor Office. Decisions are based upon reason, but national interests do not disappear, as states do not surrender their desired. The League of Nations is not a form of government, but a form of cooperation.[1]

In the past few years notable progress in diplomatic arrangements has been made and the most important step is the Kellogg Peace Pact. Through it, the nations have decreed a Declaration of Independence of War, and have denounced war as an instrument of national policy. In Article I - the nations party to the treaty condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies. In Article II - the nations agree that only peaceful means shall be sought in solving all disputes or conflicts, whatever their nature.[2] These statements are simple and brief and represent a great stride forward in promoting amicable settlements of international disputes. Navies can no longer back up national policies because nations have pledged themselves not to use them. Briand said -

> "Thus shall war, as a means of arbitrary and selfish action, no longer be deemed lawful. Thus its threat shall no longer hang over the economic political, and social life of the people."[3]

---

1. League of Nations Survey P. 14
2. C.E. Martin "Politics of Peace" P. 371
3. " " " " " P. 382

The point has now been reached where war is not only unnecessary but even unlawful.

It has been shown that there are several avenues of action for solving international difficulties by a diplomacy based upon cooperation and reason. They need to be built up and strengthened to win the confidence of governments, but they represent the sound principles upon which a new world structure of nations needs to be built if they wish to outlaw war and serve their own best interests. Also, these methods do not appear to be in any conflict with the teachings of Jesus. They involve helpfulness, sympathetic, understanding, friendship, cooperation. In them is the hope of the world. "So blunder though it may, the race moves on to the new customs and institutions essential to survival."

Gradually, thoughtful people are discovering what a futile thing war is, because of its cruelty and imbecility. Not only is it wrong to allow its existence within society, but it is also unnecessary because of the machinery already available for carrying on international affairs through methods of cooperation. However, this realization has not been attained by the great majority of people, and there is need of a strong minority movement to dramatize the issue and blaze the way towards the new world structure in which reason is substituted for force, and nationalism becomes coordinated with internationalism. The armies of peace like the armies

of war must have an advance guard to blaze the way for world unity.

This is the part being played by the conscientious objector. He believes that a social order based upon strife is impossible; that unless war is destroyed it will destroy his state for such is the logical outcome of a combative way of life. His great passion is to serve his nation and save it from possible suicide; and he believes that he is upon a solid foundation in insisting that life must be organized around the cooperative principle. War is at variance with the ideals which he possesses both for himself and for his state and therefore he must oppose it.

No one likes the label of pacifist because it has been applied to all sorts of people and often means that a pacifist is a softheaded person and rather fanatical. People do not inquire as to why the pacifist takes his stand; they do not realize that he has in back of him a well grounded theory of human relations. He is in reality much more of an advocate of a constructive program than the usual defender of things as they are.

> "Pacifism then, I would call an attitude to life arising from belief in human capacity for social action, which stresses the importance of the reaction of person upon person and group upon group, and which consequently uses only methods calculated to evoke cooperative action in seeking to achieve a progressive integration of life in every field of human relations."[1]

---

1. D. Allen "Pacifism in the Modern World" P. 4

It is not a negative thing but recognizes the value of personality. The human race is one; although the races appear differently, they are alike in the structure of essentials. It is sometimes forgotten that nations like persons react to the way in which they are approached.[1]

Pacifism cuts to the root the idea of the popular dependence on war as the last resort in the settlement of international affairs. Instead the pacifist is willing to work tirelessly to strengthen the structure for peace. The salvation of his nation may actually depend upon its successful completion, for if another war should happen all that he holds dear in his national culture would be in jeopardy of being lost. He hopes to prevent the cataclysm which draws out the beastly characteristics of men; his passion is for his state to play a noble part in the world of ideals; in the making the world safe to live in. Moreover, if his nation has become a signatory to the Kellogg Peace Pact, it has officially recognized the iniquities of war and pledged itself not to use force in the settlement of international difficulties. Consequently, a real responsibility is placed upon, not only the conscientious objector, but upon every citizen to back up this pledge and to refuse to participate in a wrong method which has been renounced by his government.

This shows that in addition to the conscientious objector the state also has ideals. These ideals are to be friendly, just, honest, cooperative with other nations; to give service

---

1. D. Allen "Pacifism in the Modern World" P. 4

and promote the good life. They sound quite similar to those of the pacifist in recognizing the value of personality.

The spirit of sturdy war resistence is growing into deep conviction. The War Resisters International has affiliated parts in twenty-one countries; the argument of protection through militarism has ceased to have weight with them.[1] As they look across the map of Europe they fail to see how armaments of war have protected anyone. In the future only peaceful means will be tolerated by them and they challenge the idea that their supreme loyalty is owed to the state if the state proceeds upon a method which is destructive. Politics ought to be a science of right, and each citizen should have the privilege to work for the right against the wrong. The modern state usually has made a place for individual liberty, freedom of conscience, and the right to adhere to religious beliefs even when they appose the states claim. In the United States our forefathers sought these shores under great hardships in the quest of religious and political liberty, and the first amendment was added to the Constitution to make safe the right of religious freedom.

The pacifist argues firstly, that the government is not really the state but only the fallible rulers or officials, representing partially the public that makes up the state. Without the consent of the governed there can be no claim of authority in a democratic state. Secondly, he argues that the state is one of the institutions created by society for

---

1. D. Allen "Pacifism in the Modern World" P. 180

its service; hence it has no claim on the individual, and thirdly, that the state is not a God above moral law, but must be judged by moral law.[1] Therefore, the highest loyalty is not to the state or government but to moral laws or God. If state loyalty conflicts with a higher one there is no question. The state has no right to ask one to be traitor to his conscience by demanding his support of war when he believes that war is the deadly foe of life. The pacifist has no quarrel with government as such, but he does resist the power of the state to violate his conscience. He conceives it part of his mission to fight against tyranny in government wherever it may arise, and a government which denies citizenship to pacifists and assumes the right to conscript citizens in war regardless of their conscientious opposition is on the road to becoming tyrannical.[1]

The question may be asked - What is to happen if minority groups rise to impose their will? The answer is that war is not produced by a majority, but by a small minority group of diplomats who may be acting in the interests of some economic group. War making governments do not take the people into their confidence, but use the methods of propaganda. Also, it is being realized that there is no relation between right and numbers; between justice and force. Majority rule is discredited as being right; almost all advances have been made by defiant minorities.[2] Because man does possess this sense of right he never actually surrenders his whole being to the

---

1. D. Allen "Pacifism in the Modern World" P. 187
2. " " " " " P. 179

state, and therefore the state does not possess his whole being.

Earlier in this thesis when considering the current theories of democratic government it was found that there is much emphasis placed upon individual rights, and the rights of conscience are the most fundamental, sacred ones. So in spite of the fact that modern nationalism insists upon supreme loyalty to governmental policies, the conscientious objector believes that he is acting perfectly within his rights by refusing any participation in war. He is merely one of the defiant minority by which progress is made; he refuses to give acquiescence to war because of its evils; and the state depends upon the acquiescence of its members for carrying on the war. Therefore, if the minority group can be increased sufficiently, war, the enemy of society, can be stopped. Surely, a citizen has the right to play a part in stopping war when it is such a curse to civilization. His desire to do so is the expression of the fact that man wishes to become the conscious arbitor of his own social destiny; its the instinct of social self-mastery by way of self-knowledge coming into play once again. So by challenging the idea of supreme state authority and claiming his right for individual action within the state, the conscientious objector plays an important part in making possible the new world structure of peace which will be of benefit to his state. The pacifist is an intellectual patriot; he tries to discover the really significant movements; the problems in his country and to work for them. The pacifist renders service to his state by creating friendliness, good-will among

nations; by removing the causes of war; by insisting upon machinery of peace. He puts life blood into the program which represents the ideals of his state. This devotion surely savors of intense loyalty to his nation.

Man holds the key to progress. A still small voice which bids him to choose persecution rather than conformity is the hope of the race. William Lloyd Garrison who was dragged through the streets of Boston with a rope around his neck wrote the next day in the Liberator - "On this subject of slavery, I do not wish to speak or write with moderation. I will not equivocate; I will not excuse; I will not retreat a single inch and I will be heard."[1]

Many references have been made to conscience. And what is this thing called conscience? The common idea has been that its an inward mentor placed by God within the bosom of man to guide him into choosing right and avoiding wrong. In this sense, it does not guide very accurately because there are opposing consciences on every side of every question. Conscience arises in childhood with the appearance of fixed purposes. It grows in the struggle between opposing desires and purposes; in the conflict between sensual pleasures of gratification which are not lasting ones and the desire for approval from the group which is lasting.[2] Representing the power of permanent purposes and ideals; it wars on the less permanent desires. It develops in people according to their teaching, intelligence, will, instincts.

---

1. H.E.Fosdick "The Old Savage in the New Civilization" P. 26

2. J. J.Ayerson "Foundations of Personality" P. 45

Man naturally likes authority; he does not want to bother to choose. This does not make for real democracy for it is apt to make a duty of non-essentials and ceremonies.[1] There is today a tendency to throw more responsibility upon the individual conscience, and it is a good sign to have responsibility placed on the individual instead of on an authority - a sign of virility and lack of decidence. Conscientious objectors are men who have thoughtfully thought their way through pleasures of gratification to the satisfaction of having permanent ideals for life. In 1918 a study was made at the United States Disciplinary Barracks at Fort Leavenworth. The result revealed the fact that the conscientious objectors of the religious and political types were high grade men, very distinctly above the other groups.[2] This superiority was especially noticeable in the case of the political objectors.

Freedom of thought, the modern state must regard as absolute. Whatever concerns the conscience of man, whatever brings its activity into operation must be sacred ground for the state. Whenever an act runs counter to man's moral nature so that he cannot carry it out and keep house with himself, his refusal to authority should command our respect.[3] Roger Baldwin wrote at the time of the last war - "I regard the principle of conscription of life as a flat contradiction of all our cherished ideals of individual freedom, democratic liberty, and Christian teaching."[4] Every man remains a judge

---

1. J.Iverson "Foundations of Personality" P. 45
2. C.M.Case "Non-violent Coercion" P. 135
3. N. Thomas "Is Conscience a Crime" P. 7
4. C.M.Case "Non-violent Coercion" P. 253

in his own case, and he remains a judge in every case that comes to him; a man never surrenders this to the state. If a measure pricks the natural inertia of man into opposition, it has probably misinterpreted the end of the state. It is also true that the reason and justice in the state is not brought to the individual from outside of him, but within him there are the dispositions which make for justice; and the justice in the state becomes his own reason externalized.[1] There exists a point within each individual beyond which the claims of the state do not carry and probably the individual gives the best service to his state by refusing to obey that which violates the authority of his conscience. There is in life a spiritual freedom which allows the individual to pursue what he believes to be good; there is within man a sacred place from which he makes his choices.

This sacred place, the conscience, develops in persons according to their teaching and intelligence and experience. This inner voice is rather highly developed within the conscientious objector because he has given much thought to the problem of war and although he may not be aware of the teachings of Jesus, he deliberately has chosen ~~a way of life~~ to act upon a principle as taught by Jesus. It has been said that Jesus was a deeply religious man; through life he experienced a close fellowship with God.

To dwell within the Kingdom of God was the most precious thing in his life; to do this it became necessary for him to take up his position without the pale of his state. His passionate

---

1. W.E.Hocking "Man and The State" P. 69

purpose was to discover and to do the will of God, and in doing this he found life - a thing far dearer to possess than pearls.

The teachings of Jesus may have a direct effect upon a war resister. His own religious experience may have brought him a deep desire to discover the will of God for himself, and to follow it. He may not be as certain of what it is as Jesus was, but he knows that its not a way of hate but a way of love. He knows that it is not following the methods of warfare but of resisting all that is evil. This inner urge drives him to express a life of love within his state; to break down racial barriers and open up new horizons of international cooperation. His passion is to serve his state, to help his nation to follow a course which is known to be right, which will bring life, and not to follow a combative method which brings death.

Therefore, he dedicates himself in service to his country. He does this first by recognizing God as the supreme authority for his choices. Then, having dedicated himself to a way of life expressed in love which includes justice, understanding, cooperation, he struggles for those qualities within his nation and resists that which is evil — warfare. His ideals and the ideals of the state have been found to be similar; for if a member of the Kellogg Pact, his state has also renounced war, recognizing it to be wrong, and has pledged itself to use only peaceful means in settlements - the cooperative methods which will bring about a new world structure of understanding. Therefore, he strikes at the evils of nationalism which are necessary for waging war, by refusing to participate in warfare itself.

This strength of character is of service to the state. Also, he believes that in refusing to accept state authority when it is at variance with his conviction of right or wrong, he is not only serving the best ideals of his state, but he is also acting within his own rights. The rights which he claims are his own, and no state has claim over them. In the United States they are guaranteed by the constitution.

Therefore, there is no conflict within the conscientious objector between religious and state loyalty. He considers himself deeply patriotic; his love for his country is so deep that he is willing to suffer for it without the pale, and to be misunderstood. A pacifist and loyal citizen are not contradictory terms, but a pacifist, having learned the great lessons of war repudiates it both for himself and his state as useless and evil. There a conflict does exist ~~it~~ is between the ideals of the state and the methods used in war. This conflict, though it may not be recognized, also exists within the lives of thousands of citizens in the United States. They accept the teachings of Jesus as those to be followed, and at the same time advocate force as the method of keeping peace in the world.

The conscientious objector dedicates himself to a whole new way of living with his fellow creatures; it is a commitment to a way of life that is creative of brotherhood and unity. By means of love he is laying the foundations of a friendly, cooperating society.[1] He is building his life in harmony with the spiritual laws of the universe which bring life, and also hopes to bring honor to his nation.

Ghandi is an exponent of this new way of life.

---

1. D. Allen "Fight for Peace" P. 668
2. 1st Constitutional Amendment

He is the leader of a new type of revolution, and his method of passive resistence has had great influence with Great Britain. It has won for India an amount of freedom, undreamed of a few years ago. Ghandi is proving that non-violence is more potent than violence.

VI - CONCLUSION.

The purpose of this thesis has been to throw light upon the conflict at the time of war between being loyal to ones state and loyal to the teachings of Jesus. If a citizen feels a deep affection for his state, and at the same time hears his conscience whisper that war is not the way of brotherly love as Jesus taught, what is he to do? This is the problem which has been answered in this thesis.

It has become apparent that men naturally organize themselves into a state and have done so for hundreds of years. Man seems to have committed himself to the proposition that a state is necessary and that it serves his own good. He finds in the state an apportunity to give direction to his own social destiny, because in him is this instinct for progress and self-mastery. Activities in civilized communities have become so varied and complex that they can't be left to the spontaneous regulation of individuals. They have to be organized within a state and this institution exists to serve man - to give him and his family life and

protection.

It was discovered that up to the present time, the most ideal type of state is the modern democratic state. In the United States, our forefathers courageously faced a hard, new life to found a government in which they would have liberty and freedom, and when a constitution was drawn up, after the War of Independence, these rights were carefully preserved. Also it was found that a direct responsibility is placed upon individuals in a modern democratic state, because what the government is depends upon the individual. It will be what the citizens make it - this involves conscience and an active interest in the affairs of the state in order that they be kept right. Again, whatever the government does is dependent upon the consent of the people, because it is impossible for the state to act against genuine opposition. In this way the state is limited in what it does, and is dependent upon the acquiescence of its individual members in order to carry out any policy.

It was also found that states today feel a great dependency upon force; they believe that to be safe they must be strong, but it has been shown that this use of force brings not security but warfare. ~~However~~ Moreover, no purpose has been found great enough to justify war, for the results are all bad. Still, war has been said to be inevitable because of human nature, but human nature slowly changes for the better. It can't be justified on the basis of being right because

both sides always claim to be right and two sides can't be right at the same time. War does not make for virility within a nation because it takes the best blood - not the worst and there is no end to the resultant social and economic evils. In fact, it has been shown that modern warfare sacrifices the very end for which a state exists — to pursue a good life, whatever that may be, and to serve its members.

As Jesus has been the greatest religious genius in history and has exercised tremendous influence over people for generations, his teachings have been considered. It was found that war means nothing which Jesus meant by his teaching. Jesus taught that life, a thing more precious than pearls, comes from doing the will of God which involves giving all of ones self to the known good of living a life of brotherly love. For him there were no superior races, and he lived consistently - doing that which he could to help everyone.

Then, in comparing the teachings of Jesus and certain methods of the state a great confluct has been revealed. The state has been idealized in the minds of people, but it is far from being a perfect institution. However, this conflict was shown to be unnecessary. The world can be organized upon a basis of cooperation. National cultures need not be rivals; international cooperation already does exist to a certain extent and can be further developed.

Therefore, instead of basing its continuity upon force, it has been outlined that there is the possibility of building a new world structure based upon cooperative methods.

This is according to the teachings of Jesus — the cooperator lives, but the combative way of life brings death. The substitutes for force were said to be the developing of reason because in the end the mind overcomes the sword; the coordinating of nationalism and internationalism, especially through education; and the building of a new diplomacy, built upon inter-national law, arbitration, conferences. These ways resemble the teachings of Jesus as they involve patience, sympathetic understanding, and cooperation.

Furthermore, it was found that national governments have been working towards these ends. This shows that governments do have ideals. As proof of it, the Kellogg Peace Pact was sighted. By it states have decided to outlaw war and to use only peaceful methods in the settlement of difficulties. Consequently, it was found that ideals of the nation appear also to resemble the teachings of Jesus. States do have moral standards although they may not as yet measure up to the individual's standard.

Several times it was stated that the actual sovereignty of a state is subject to limitation; that its power is never absolute at any time because it depends upon the consent of its citizens. This is the place where the conscientious objector came into prominence. As war actually depends upon the acquiescence of its people; it cannot be carried on without civil obedience. And although it has become axiomatic that obedience to a constitutional government is a necessity

for the life of a nation, still war resisters have come to realize that they can actually prevent war and its evils if they can build up a strong minority group.

Therefore, the observation was made that the conscientious objector in having seen a greater concert for his state in creating a world unity than fighting, gives himself loyally to serving the ideal of his state. He wishes to purify nationalism, and he believes that in following the teachings of Jesus, he finds life not only for himself, but for his state. In making the new world structure based upon cooperation, he helps his state to take an active part in a world where life has become so inter-dependent that a unified order has become a necessity. He wishes his state to lose its present life if need be that it may save it in the service of a better order. He is loyal to both his state and to Jesus.

It has been said that the conscientious objector recognizes his conscience as his authority in working for a good life. This is as Jesus taught - there is no connection between the state and religion. But a pacifist may also desire passionately to serve the best interests of his state, its best ideals. Therefore, when war threatens he rebels, and to do so he feels to be his right, given him by the state. In the United States, he is protected by the constitution.

Therefore, it has been proven that there is no conflict within the conscientious objector between state loyalty and religious loyalty. From this it can be concluded that no

conflict need exist between a person who at the time of war wishes to serve his state and at the same time be loyal to the teachings of Jesus. By being loyal to Jesus, he is being most loyal to his state. In the long run, he serves the ideals of his state the most, by resisting war and its immoral methods. However, an enlightened state should arrange its affairs so that this apparent conflict of conscience and national requirements would be removed.

Bibliography

Devere Allen * "The Fight for Peace"
Macmillan Co. 1930
* "Pacifism in The Modern World"
Doubleday, Doran & Co. 1929

Norman Angell "American Diplomacy"
Viking Press 1919

Friedrich Bernhardi "Germany in The Next War"
Longman's Green & Co. 1914
Translator Allen H. Powles

William P. Bliss "The New Encyclopedia of Social Reform" -
Chapter on Anarchism.
Funk and Wagnalls Co. 1910

James Bryce * "International Relations"
MacMillan Co. 1927
"Modern Democracies"
MacMillan Co. 1927

Clarence Marsh Case * "Non-violent Coercion"
Century Co. 1920

Zechariah Chafee Jr. "Freedom of Speech"
Harcout Bryce & Co. 1919

John W. Coutts * "The Gospel and International Relations"
London Student Christian
Movement 1923

*
The Covenant of the League of Nations

Andrew F. Cowan "Problems of Secret Diplomacy"
Longmans Green & Co. 1923

John Dewey "The Public and Its Problems"
Henry Holt Co. 1927

Sherwood Eddy & Kirby Page
* "Danger Zones of the Social Order
George H. Doran Co. 1924

Herbert Adams Gibbons * "Nationalism and Internationalism"
Frederick A. Stokes Co. 1930

George Glasgow "From Daves to Locarno"
Harper & Bros. 1926

Raymond B. Fosdick * "The Old Savage in the New Civilization"
Doubleday, Doran & Co. 1917

Thomas Fill Green "The Principles of Political Obligation" -
Chapter on The Contract Theory
Longmans Green & Co. 1895

Dwight Hadley "Freedom and Responsibility"
Charles Scribner's 1903

F. Wilson Harris * "What the League of Nations Is"
League of Nations Non-Partisan
Association 1925

Carlton J. H. Hayes "War and The Nations"
Political Science Quarterly -
Dec. 1914

* "Essays on Nationalism"
Macmillan Co. 1926

Oril Henthorne * "Why I Returned My Croix de Guerre
Fellowship of Reconciliation 1926

Joyce O. Hertzler "Social Progress" - Chapter 18
Century Co. 1928

Granville Hicks "The Parsons and The War"
American Mercury Feb. 1927

William W. Hocking * "Man and The State"
Yale University Press 1926

Frederick C. Howe * "Confessions of a Reformer
Charles Scribners Sons 1925

Will Irwin * "The Next War"
W.C.T.U. 1921

E. E. Krehbiel * "Nationalism, War and Society"
Macmillan Co. 1920

Harold J. Laski * "Authority in the Modern State"
Yale University Press 1919

* "Studies in the Problem of Sovereignty"- Chap. 1
Yale University Press 1917

Walter Lippman * "The Phantom Public"
Macmillan Co. 1922

Charles E. Martin * "The Politics of Peace
Stanford University Press 1929

Johannes Mattern * "Concepts of State Sovereignty and
International Law"
The John Hopkins Press 1928

Lucia Ames Mead	"Law or War" Doubleday, Doran & Co. 1928
A Message to the Churches	"National Committee on the Churches and World Peace" 1929 and 1930
Abraham Myerson	"The Foundation of Personality" - A Chapter on Conscience Little Brown & Co. 1925
Albrecht Mendesohn-Bartholdi	"Europes Diplomatic Past Brought to Light" The Yale University Press 1926
Parker T. Moon	"Imperialism and World Peace" Macmillan Co. 1926
Frank Oppenheimer	"The State - Its History and Development Viewed Sociologically Vanguard Press 1915
Frederick A. Ogg and P. Orman Ray	* "Introduction to American Government" The Century Co. 19[illegible] pp.1-72
Kirby Page	"An American Peace Policy" George H. Doran Co. 1925 "Jesus or Christianity" Doubleday, Doran & Co. 1929 "International Relations in the Light of the Religion of Jesus Kirby Page 1926 "National Peace Department" Kirby Page 1927 "War, Its Consequences, Cause and Cure George H. Doran Co. 1925
Kennell Rodd	* "The Old and New Diplomacy" Longman's Green & Co. 1923
Theodore Roosevelt	"Fear God and Take Your Own Part" George H. Doran Co. 1923
Bertrand Russell	"Why Men Fight" Century Co. 1917
Tucker Smith	"Two Minds on Military Training" The Womens Press Feb. 1931
Max Stirner	"The Ego and His Own Boni & Liveright
Clarence L. Swartz	"What is Mutualism" Vanguard Press 1927
A Survey of the League of Nations	L. of N. Non-Partisan Ass'c. 1926

Leo Tolstoi	"War, Patriotism and Peace" Vanguard Press 1926 "Social Evils and the Remedy" Methuen Co. 1917
Norman Thomas	"Is Conscience a Crime" Vanguard Press 1927 "The Conscientious Objector in America" B. W. Huebsch, Inc. 1923
Benjamin R. Tucker	"Individual Liberty Vanguard Press 1926

* The books starred have been carefully studied.
The others have been looked through for the material pertinent to the subject.

A SPECIAL STUDY

of

"The Records of Jesus" - arranged by H. R. Sharman.
Two seminar courses under the leadership of Dr. Sharman were attended at which "The Records of Jesus" were given careful and critical study.

+	Henry J. Cadbury	"An Inadequate Pacifism" The Christian Century, Jan. 3,'24
o	William James	"Memoirs and Studies" "Moral Equivalent of War" chapter Longmans Green & Co. 1911

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
1 1719 02574 9468